DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 535 FL 014 372

AUTHOR	Arnberg, Lenore
TITLE	Bilingual Education for Preschool Children.
INSTITUTION	Linkoping Univ. (Sweden). Dept. of Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-91-7372-715-6; LiU-PEK-R-84
PUB DATE	Oct 83
NOTE	71p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; *Bilingual Education; Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum; English (Second Language); Instructional Materials; Parent Participation; *Preschool Children; Program Descriptions; Program Design; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Research Needs; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Sweden

ABSTRACT

A review of ERIC literature, descriptions of 20 preschool bilingual education programs around the world, and information obtained that would be useful in Swedish program development and research are presented. A section giving background on bilingual education looks at types of programs, relationships of programs with external factors, assimilation versus cultural pluralism, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the English as a second language approach, and the bilingual-bicultural approach. A section describing the 20 programs outlines their characteristics (language group, goals, language distribution, staff, materials, teacher training, parental involvement, evaluation, and evaluation results), language training programs and methods, teacher training, the relationship of bilingual education and the home (programs emphasizing some parental involvement and recommendations made in the literature for parental involvement), and available resources and resource centers. A final review section looks at the importance of considering background factors in program development, methodological and group factors related to language learning, parental involvement, local versus centralized support for teacher training and materials development, and the importance of program evaluation. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245535

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Lenore Arnberg

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lenore Arnberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014372

LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY
Department of Education
REPORT LiU-PEK-R-84

LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY
Department of Education
Report LiU-PEK-R-84

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

by

Lenore Arnberg

October 1983

LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY
Department of Education
Report LiU-PEK-R-84

BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Copyright Department of Education Board

Printed in Sweden. All rights reserved. This book, or part thereof, may not be reproduced without the written permission of the Director, Department of Education.

Inquiries about the book should be made to:
The Director, Department of Education
Linköping University
S-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

ISBN 91-7372-715-6
ISSN 0348-4785

Linköping University
Department of Education
S-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

Avdelning, institution, fakultet

Pedagogiska institutionen

ISBN: 91-7372-715-6

ISSN: 0348-4785

Rapportnr:

Upplagans storlek:

Datum:

Projekt: Alternativ för språkträning av tvåspråkiga förskolebarn

Titel: Bilingual Education for Preschool Children

Författare: Lenore Arnberg

Uppdragsgivare:

Delegationen för social forskning

Dnr: DSF 80/11

Rapporttyp:

- ☐ Ansökan
- ☐ Delrapport
- ☐ Reserapport
- ☒ Slutrapport
- ☐ Övrig rapport

Rapportspråk:

- ☐ Svenska
- ☒ Engelska
- ☐ _____

Sammanfattning (högst 150 ord)

Bilingual education is a worldwide phenomenon and there is much to be learned from the experiences and research in other countries. The present paper describes a number of bilingual education programs abroad for preschool children in order to provide information which can be useful for further program development and research in Sweden. Following a background discussion of some issues central to bilingual education as a whole, twenty preschool programs resulting from an ERIC search are described. Areas focused on include curricula, teacher training, language training, parental involvement, resources development and evaluation. The paper concludes with a discussion of areas needing further research.

Nyckelord (högst 8)

Bilingual education, preschool children, language instruction, English (second language), parent participation

Bibliotekets anteckningar

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	7
1. INTRODUCTION	9
2. BACKGROUND	11
2.1 Types of Bilingual Education Programs	11
2.2 Bilingual Education in Relation to External Factors	14
2.3 Assimilation versus Cultural Pluralism	15
2.4 The Bilingual Education Act of 1968	17
2.5 The ESL (English as a Second Language) Approach	19
2.6 The Bilingual-Bicultural Approach	20
2.7 A Brief Overview of Bilingual Education and Some Related Problems	22
3. BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE PRESCHOOL LEVEL	25
3.1 Introduction	25
3.2 Results	30
3.2.1 Programs	30
3.2.2 Language Group	31
3.2.3 Goals	31
3.2.4 Distribution of the Languages	32
3.2.5 Staff	32
3.2.6 Materials	32
3.2.7 Teacher Training	33
3.2.8 Parental Involvement	33
3.2.9 Evaluation	33
3.2.10 Evaluation Results	34
3.3 Language Instruction	34
3.3.1 Language Training Programs	35
3.3.2 Language Training Methods	36
3.4 Teacher Training	37
3.5 Bilingual Education and the Home	39
3.5.1 Programs Emphasizing Some Aspects of Parental Involvement	39
3.5.2 Recommendations for Parental Involvement from the Literature	42
3.5.2.1 Collecting Background Information from Parents	42
3.5.2.2 Auxiliary Courses for Parents	42
3.5.2.3 Newsletters	42
3.5.2.4 Parental Involvement in the Classroom	43
3.6 Resources and Resource Centers	43
4. DISCUSSION	45
4.1 The Importance of Considering Background Factors in Program Development	45
4.2 Factors Related to Language Learning	46
4.2.1 Mixed or Non-Mixed Groups of Majority and Minority Children	46

		Page
4.2.2	Sequential or Simultaneous Presentation of the Languages	47
4.2.3	Integrated Language Learning or Special Language Lessons	48
4.3	Parental Involvement in Bilingual Education Programs	49
4.4	Local versus Central Support for Teacher Training, Materials Development and Dissemination	51
4.5	The Importance of Program Evaluation	52
REFERENCES		55
APPENDIX		

PREFACE

This work has been carried out as part of a research project sponsored by the Swedish Delegation for Social Research. The project aims to investigate methods for the education of preschool bilingual children, both in the context of the home and preschool and to study the effects of home language playgroups for young children and mothers on the maintenance of the home language. The author wishes to thank Inga-Britta Åstedt, National Social Welfare Board, for her support of the project.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present paper is to describe bilingual education programs abroad for the preschool child, including such areas as curricula, teacher training, language training methods, parental involvement, resources and further research needs. In many countries today, similar problems have been experienced with regard to the education of linguistic minority group children. It is therefore important for educators and researchers to adopt an international perspective, especially in view of the relatively little research which has thus far been conducted (NCBE, 1980). Through the sharing of information, research and program implementation can progress from an already existing body of knowledge, enabling a focus on more specific issues.

A secondary purpose of the report is to make available to Swedish practitioners and others working in the field a large body of information mainly contained in governmentally funded research reports published in microfilm form. With consideration to the time-consuming nature of reading the enormous quantity of material available, much of this information is assumed to be inaccessible, and a summary of the findings would therefore appear to be useful. The present description of programs is mainly based on the results from an ERIC search. The ERIC database, however, mainly covers educational research from the United States. (For a discussion of bilingual educational programs for young children in England and Wales, see Arnberg, 1982.) Nevertheless, considering the extent of literature in the United States on bilingual education, as well as the diversity of programs, there is much of value for understanding bilingualism in other contexts.

As mentioned above, the main focus of the report is on the description of programs, methods, materials, etc. Such a description, however, becomes more meaningful when seen in relation to a general description of bilingual education as a whole. The report thus begins with a discussion of different types of bilingual education programs, the relation of bilingual education to external factors such as sociolinguistic patterns in the community, and the issue of assimilation versus cultural pluralism which is central to the discussion of bilingual education. This is followed by a brief description of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the ESL (English as a Second Language) and bilingual approaches, and a brief overview of the current status of bilingual education and some of its problems. These areas constitute the background of the report. The second section focuses specifically on bilingual education programs at the preschool level. A number of programs located

through the ERIC search are described, and the areas of language training, teacher training, parental involvement, and resources are discussed in somewhat greater detail. The report concludes with a discussion of areas needing further research.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Types of Bilingual Education Programs

Although other more detailed typologies are available (see, e.g., Mackey, 1972 and a discussion of this typology by Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981) a model by Fishman and Lovas (1970) is useful as it focuses on two main aspects of bilingual/bicultural programs which researchers have identified as most relevant (Tosi, 1979). These are the role of the L1 (mother tongue) in the curriculum and the impact of minority language maintenance in the overall socio-cultural context.

Fishman and Lovas (op. cit.) distinguish between four main types of bilingual educational programs:

1. Transitional bilingualism: In this type of program the minority language is used in the early years until the students have mastered the majority language to the extent that it can be used as a medium of instruction. Such programs do not aim at maintaining the bilingual's two languages throughout the school years but rather to increase the overall achievement of the child by using both languages as media for instruction in the primary grades. According to the authors, "such programs (consciously or unconsciously) correspond to a societal objective of language shift and give no consideration to long range institutional development and support of the mother tongue (p. 217)."

2. Monoliterate bilingualism: Programs of this type aim to develop aural-oral skills in both languages but are not concerned with developing literacy skills in the mother tongue. The authors suggest, however, that if literacy skills are not developed, the mother tongue will be confined to the domains of the home and neighborhood. Although in the short run, such programs may lead to language maintenance, considering the importance placed on literacy in industrialized western societies, they may eventually result in language shift.

3. Partial bilingualism: In this type of program, fluency and literacy are developed in both languages but literacy in the mother tongue is limited to certain subject areas which relate to the ethnic group and its cultural heritage. Subjects related to technological and economic spheres are taught through the medium of the majority language. Although this may lead to language maintenance, it implies that the minority language

has less worth than the majority language. In connection with this, Christian (1977) points out the role of prestige factors in second language learning, one of these being the extent to which a language is associated with school subjects emphasizing cognitive development rather than artistic or emotive sensitivity.

4. Full bilingualism: In this type of program, students develop all skills in both languages in all domains, e.g., in one program students were taught in all subjects during half the day in each language. Although this type of program may be desirable at the individual level, it does not seem to be conducive to societal goals. Fishman and Lovas (1970) suggest that a fully balanced speech community would appear to be a theoretical impossibility because no society can be motivated to maintain two languages if they are funtionally redundant (see also Gaarder, 1975).

Similar typologies appear in González (1975) and in Garcia (1980) which are useful in that they more specifically describe characteristics related to classroom factors associated with the models. In addition, González has a fifth model (which is termed "culturally pluralistic") in which all students, both majority and minority, participate in the bilingual program.

The Fishman and Lovas (op. cit.) typology described above is useful in relating bilingual education to the larger societal context, but is difficult to apply to programs currently in existence in Sweden. The main "bilingual" model in use, i.e., one in which half the class is composed of Swedish children and the other half immigrant children from one minority group has been described as being "transitional" (Johannesson, 1975), although students are first taught to read and write in the mother tongue, thus placing it in the category of "partial bilingualism." The "mother tongue" model (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981) is not accounted for in the above description although its aims are similar to those of "full bilingualism." Another difficulty with Fishman and Lovas' model is that it does not specify whether the bilingual program is intended for minority students alone or for both minority and majority students.

In a more recent socio-curricular model description (Fishman, 1977), the context of migrant workers in Europe is more specifically focused on. Here three types of programs are differentiated:

1) Compensatory/transitional: (Identical to "transitional bilingualism" above)

2) Language maintenance: L1 is emphasized and introduced as a more stable medium of instruction while L2 is introduced gradually until both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects. The result is balanced bilingualism, cultural pluralism, and a digolssic relationship between the languages.

3) Enrichment oriented: Bilingual education as in the maintenance (2) model; intended for all students, both majority and minority.

Fishman (op. cit.) warns against the first two types of bilingualism, suggesting that the first is absorptive and that the second, although encouraging societal bilingualism and cultural pluralism, can become separative. The third model is recommended as being "neither absorptive nor separative, but an additive and enriching one for both the marked and unmarked populations involved (in Tosi, 1979, p. 224)."

Tosi (op. cit.) also suggests that transitional bilingualism would appear unsuitable in view of the possibility of a return to the country of origin. On the other hand, although fluency and literacy in both languages are considered to be highly desirable, doubt is expressed concerning whether the marked language will be used as a medium of instruction in European schools. Tosi concludes by suggesting that decisions will have to be made in relation to each minority group and that "Europe will require more than one model to meet the varied needs of groups sharply divided in their demands and aspirations (p. 225)."

Returning to the usefulness of Fishman's (1977) typology in describing programs in Sweden, although it may not be more useful than the previous model in its descriptive power, it helps to focus more specifically on several central questions in bilingual education. These are the transition-maintenance question and the question of whether, in order to achieve more long-ranging goals of bilingualism and biculturalism, bilingual education must involve majority as well as minority students.

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to answer these highly complex questions, one point is of interest. Edwards (1981) suggests that when considering the advantages for either a transitional or a maintenance model on the child's language development, all other factors being equal, there may not be an overwhelming advantage for either. Thus the question of transition

or maintenance models may be more closely related to ideological or political issues than to linguistic or pedagogical ones. In connection with this, it is of interest to point out that the same arguments used against the mother tongue model in Sweden, i.e., that it may lead to a segregation of the minority group and result in children's failure to learn Swedish adequately, appear in reference to bilingual models in the United States.

The distinction between transition- and maintenance-oriented programs is even more difficult to make at the preschool level where this issue need not be confronted directly, as both languages are seen as having importance for the child's development and school adjustment. Thus, it is often difficult to determine a particular program's position on this issue. Garcia (1980), however, states that there is yet very little evidence on which to base even a highly cautious answer to the question of which educational model should be used in early childhood bilingual education.

2.2 Bilingual Education in Relation to External Factors

In addition to examining the notions of transition and maintenance in relation to the educational program itself, these notions must also be examined in relation to the wider socio-cultural context and to the process of language shift or language maintenance in the community. Kjolseth (1971) suggests that no bilingual program in itself can be considered to be shift- or maintenance-oriented but that the emphasis on one direction or the other is achieved within the specific socio-economic-cultural context of ethnic relations between the groups concerned. Tucker (1977) suggests that all the best programs are of no avail if attitudes in the dominant community are negative toward the program. Several authors also suggest that schools are conservative institutions which tend to follow rather than to lead society (see, e.g., Macnamara, 1972). Thus a bilingual education program in itself may not be able to reverse language shift or maintenance trends in a given community.

Paulston (1975) states that research on bilingual education tends to treat the bilingual education program as the independent variable, i.e., the factor which accounts for what the results of the program are. She suggests the following:

> Unless we try in some way to account for the socio-historical, cultural, and economical-political factors which lead to certain forms of bilingual education, we will never understand the consequences of that education.

In other words, we need research which looks at bilingual education as the intervening or dependent variable and we don't have it (p. 370).

Fishman and Lovas (1970) emphasize the importance of gathering societal information as part of the decision-making process regarding what type of bilingual program to implement. Without such information, a program may, e.g., be attempting a policy of language maintenance while the surrounding community is undergoing a process of language shift or vice versa.

Societal factors are of course not the only kinds of factors which contribute to the variance in results concerning different educational models. Löfgren (1981) identifies six factors having importance for students' learning, i.e., teachers, curricula and teaching methods, classroom organization, school organization, parents and students. These factors are difficult to isolate and thus it is difficult to ensure that groups undergoing different educational treatments are comparable in all respects.

These two groups of factors, i.e., "societal" factors and "learning" factors need not be independent of one another. Teacher attitudes, curricula, and parental factors, e.g., may reflect more general relationships between majority and minority groups at the societal level. On the other hand, factors such as personality and aptitude within the individual student may not reflect relationships at the societal level.

2.3 Assimilation versus Cultural Pluralism

A closely related issue to the transition-maintenance question in bilingual education is that of assimilation and cultural pluralism in that proponents of maintenance bilingual education are also proponents of cultural pluralism. Edwards (1980, 1981), however, suggests that the issue of cultural pluralism needs closer examination.

One of the main points which Edwards makes concerns whether cultural pluralism is desired by all members of the ethnic group or if it is a "top-down" phenomenon, i.e., representing the views of elitist members of the ethnic group alone. He quotes Higham (1975) who suggested that "cultural pluralism would appeal to people who were already strongly enough positioned to imagine that permanent minority status might be advantageous (p. 211)."

Edwards suggests that there is a tendency to see assimilation as "bad" and cultural pluralism as "good" and criticizes this dichotomy for several reasons:

1) Cultural pluralism may be desired by assimilated individuals who may not be typical of their group.

2) Assimilation does not completely destroy ethnicity as some might think.

3) Cultural pluralism is not necessarily a positive thing. It may segregate a group and is not always conducive to democracy, especially if there are unequal power distributions in the society.

4) Many proponents of cultural pluralism may maintain an over-romantic view of the past.

Edwards (1981) further suggests that assimilation may be a natural adjustment to a new society. Ravitch (1976) points out the "choice element" in adopting the culture of a new country, suggesting that to assume that immigrants are forced to become assimilated credits them with little intelligence or self-interest. It is more likely that they take from the new culture the elements which they desire and ignore the rest.

Edwards (1981) concludes by suggesting the desirability of some combination of assimilation and cultural pluralism, e.g., "pluralistic integration" (Higham, 1975).

One problem with the above arguments concerning cultural pluralism, however, is that they do not adequately consider the extent to which minority group members, being a subordinate group politically, economically, and socially, may be able to voice their opinions and initiate social changes which may be desired (Padilla, 1975). Many immigrants may have already had "minority status" in their country of origin and, thus, may have a history of being alienated from the dominant culture and handicapped in their ability to compete socially (Tosi, 1981). This is also supported by Gaarder (1975) who suggests that a great many non-English speakers wish their languages could be maintained and strengthened, but few have knowledge concerning what would be required in terms of political, economic, and educational change to carry this out. Edwards (1981), however, states that a "hands-off" policy is not being suggested but, rather, a sensitivity to the system one is trying to alter. Here again one is reminded of the importance of collecting sociolinguistic data from the community as well as involving minority groups themselves in policy decisions. This is not only as a recognition of their "adulthood," but ensures that the social and linguistic orientation of the neighborhood has been correctly interpreted (Tosi, 1979).

Another problem with Edwards' arguments concerning assimilation and cultural pluralism is that they do not adequately consider the role of factors such as the size of the immigrant group or its geographic proximity to the country of origin in an ethnic group's ability to maintain its language and culture. The situation of the Finns in Sweden, e.g., may give this group certain advantages in maintaining the ethnic language and culture which other groups do not enjoy, i.e., their number, the proximity to Finland, the continual inflow of new members of the ethnic group as a result of Scandinavian labor agreements, etc. At the same time, however, Finnish attitudes toward bilingual education and cultural pluralism cannot be assumed to be representative of those of other minority group members. In a recent conversation between the author and a group of Yugoslavian mothers, e.g., it became apparent that the mothers viewed mother tongue school classes as a means of segregating their ethnic group from the mainstream society and limiting their children's possibilities for competing for higher educational positions.

With regard to the issue of the coexistence of more than one language in a society, there is also a need to reexamine the notion that no society can afford to have two languages which serve the same function (Fishman & Lovas, 1970; Gaarder, 1975). Although this may have been true in the past, changing factors such as increased international commerce, the ease of traveling, satellite television and video, more leisure time for language learning, etc, may have resulted in more favorable conditions for bilingual maintenance than those existing in the past, for some languages at least.

2.4 The United States Bilingual Education Act of 1968

For a historical description of bilingual education in the United States the reader is referred to a report published by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1975). A more concise description appears in González (1975).

In the 1960's there was a growing recognition in the United States of the special language needs of minority children. Efforts to help these children mainly took the form of supplemental English language lessons referred to as the ESL (English as a second language) approach. This approach, for reasons to be discussed shortly, was generally found to be inadequate to meet the needs of minority children and in 1968 the Bilingual Education Act was passed providing federal funding for a large number of bilingual programs. The Act was reauthorized in 1974 and 1978 and will be considered again for reauthorization in 1982.

Whether the original purpose of the Act was in fact to encourage bilingualism is questionable, however, as can be seen by the following statement by the National Institute of Education (1975; in Paulston, 1978):

> The principal piece of legislation, the Title VII amendment to the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is designed to meet the needs of children of limited English-speaking ability from low income families, so that these children will gain sufficient proficiency in English to keep up with their mono-lingual English-speaking peers in the educational system. Although the Title VII amendment is often referred to as "The Bilingual Education Act," this is rather misleading, since the long range goal is not bilingualism but proficiency in English.

Roeming (1970) also questioned the assumption that the Congressional Act established an interest in bilingualism and furthermore suggested that it was essentially an antipoverty measure (see also DiPietro, 1978). González (1975) suggested that as the Act was based on a remedial/compensatory model of minority group education, it maintained the "melting pot" syndrome. Gaarder (1975), however, suggested that the Act was worded ambiguously enough to allow for interpretations by proponents of both transitional and maintenance approaches.

According to information published by the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, the dilemma with the original Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was its failure to provide means of assessing the success of programs or to specify characteristics necessary for programs to be established. The 1968 Act was thus superseded by the Bilingual Education Act of 1974 which more carefully specified the intent and design of bilingual programs. In addition, a National Advisory Council for Bilingual Education (NACBE) was formed to monitor the progress of government funded bilingual programs. The 1974 Act also eliminated the requirement that participating children be from low income families, thus increasing the possibilities of extending bilingual programs to majority students as well. According to Edwards (1981), however, the correlation between limited English-speaking ability and low family income tends to ensure that the majority of programs continue to serve mainly children from lower socioeconomic levels.

Most bilingual programs have thus been described as being of the "transitional" type (Fishman, 1982)[1]. Kjolseth (1972) estimated that over 80 percent of the programs were of this type and that the remainder were not strongly committed to cultural pluralism. Edwards (1981), however, suggests that much of the academic community working in the field of bilingual education is opposed to the transitional philosophy.

[1] Fishman, J.A. Lecture at Stockholm University, August 30, 1982.

2.5 The ESL (English as a Second Language) Approach

In a typical ESL program, children receive all subject area instruction in English (with no special consideration taken of their special language needs and together with monolingual English speakers) and are "pulled out" for special English language skills training, this being mainly in the areas of listening comprehension and speaking. The particular ESL methods used depend on the theoretical assumptions underlying the program and usually involve either an "audio-lingual" or a "cognitive code" approach (see USCCR[1] report, 1975).

One problem with this approach is that the child is taught reading in the regular program and thus language learning does not follow the ordinary sequence of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Another problem is that, aside from the ESL class, knowledge acquisition is occurring via a second language with the result that learning tasks become more difficult than they were originally designed to be. Saville and Troike (1973) suggest that initial experiences of frustration and failure may remain with the child throughout his school career. It can also be pointed out that the "pull out" approach (see above) is discouraged in England as many feel that it may be associated with learning difficulties by the child (Arnberg, 1982).

What becomes immediately clear in reference to the ESL approach described above is that it is not necessarily the approach itself which is at fault but the fact that second language methods are confined to the area of language acquisition skills alone. One of the recommendations made in the USCCR report (1975) was that an English support component be made available in all subject matter areas. A related question concerns whether the child becomes more motivated to learn a second language when it is presented through subject matter which is inherently interesting or when it occurs through separate language lessons (see, e.g., Tucker, 1974).

The USCCR report also suggested that an ESL approach may be useful with minority children who have some knowledge of the second language when starting school as well as who have enough exposure to English outside school to be able to function as native speakers in a relatively short period of time. The fact that linguistic skills in any given minority group may vary greatly is supported, among others, by Carrow (1971) who emphasized the importance of tailoring educational programs to fit the needs of individuals within

[1] United States Commission on Civil Rights

the group. This suggests the need for some type of language assessment, even if rudimentary, in order to decide what type of educational program is suitable for an individual child. Other factors related to the success of ESL methods may be the size of the minority group being accommodated in the classroom as well as the teacher's degree of training in second language teaching methods.

Although the discussion of ESL methods has not focused specifically on the preschool child, as will be seen in the next section, several of the programs considered to be "bilingual" have in fact been ESL programs. It is also important to note that most bilingual programs include an ESL component.

2.6 The Bilingual-Bicultural Approach

Bilingual-bicultural programs are seen as an alternative to the ESL approach for teaching the linguistic minority child. It is of interest that the bilingual-bicultural approach recognizes a number of factors having importance in improving the child's educational performance in addition to linguistic factors alone. This is not to suggest that ESL programs cannot also be multidimensional in nature, e.g., through attempting to change teacher attitudes or developing bicultural curriculum materials in English. Such characteristics, however, have not often been typical of ESL programs in the past. Some of the areas which bilingual-bicultural programs focus on are as follows. (Much of the following discussion is based on information presented in the USCCR report (1975).)

1. The child's self-concept: Some researchers have emphasized the importance of a positive self-concept in order for learning to take place. Escobedo (1978) has reviewed the literature with regard to self-concept and achievement. It is suggested that children have little inclination to achieve until some sense of belonging is established, as the child's sense of stress may allow little energy over for academic endeavor. The child's self-concept may be affected by such factors as how teachers relate to them, whether children experience success or failure, whether textbooks and learning activities portray experiences which are familiar to the child, etc. Children who find their values and learning styles ignored may become alienated from the school.

2. Teacher attitudes: In several studies it was found that Mexican-American students received less praise and encouragement from teachers, were questioned substantially less, and were less likely to have their ideas or

contributions used than were their Anglo peers. Low teacher expectations may affect students' self-concept, as mentioned earlier, as well as other areas such as language development because they may result in less student-teacher verbal interaction.

3. Concept formation: One view of the relation between thought and language is that language development follows concept formation but has an important role in helping to define and to clarify concepts. Here the young bilingual child taught through the medium of a second language may be disadvantaged because the second language is not sufficiently developed to enable it to be used in the recall and manipulation of concepts. Concept acquisition is also facilitated by using one's own language because language learning presents no interference to the assimilation of content and because new concepts can be connected to existing ones.

   It is also important to point out the role of cultural and socioeconomic factors in connection with the child's concept formation. If there is a cultural or socioeconomic mismatch between the home and school environments, the child may lack certain basic concepts which he is expected to possess when beginning school. If the child comes from an understimulated home environment he may be learning an entirely new set of concepts through a language which he does not understand. Meyerson (1969) points this out in connection with second language teaching methods, i.e., the methods depend on whether one is giving the child new words for well-developed concepts for which he has adequate words in the mother tongue or introducing a whole new set of words and ideas in a language-deprived environment.

   With regard to cultural factors, new concepts may be easier to learn when they are related to experiences familiar to the child. For example, if teaching a Navajo child to sequence events, it may be easier for the child to learn the concept in relation to taking care of sheep than a trip to the supermarket.

4. Cultural factors: Cultural factors may also directly influence language development, as well as general school performance, in that certain patterns of verbal interaction may be foreign to some cultural groups. For example, for a Navajo child, even a question such as "What is your name?" may be seen as an intrusion into the child's privacy. Pfeiffer (1975) also suggests that Navajo children are taught to observe and to listen

rather than to verbalize, to avoid eye contact as it shows a lack of respect, to avoid competition, and to value generosity.

Padilla (1975) suggests the existence of cognitive learning styles which are culturally bound. Mexican-American children have been described as being field sensitive whereas Anglo children have been described as being field independent. The extent to which such learning styles may characterize all members of a minority group, e.g., across social-class boundaries, however, is not clear.

5. Language factors: Several writers suggest that the child from an advantaged home may experience no difficulty in learning a second language (Carrow, 1957; Meyerson, 1969). Disadvantaged children, however, may come to school with a paucity of linguistic stimulation, without reinforcement of speech, without answers to many "why" questions and without names for many of the objects around them (Meyerson, op. cit.). Thus, the use of the mother tongue in a bilingual program may have an important role in compensating for a lack of verbal interaction in the home which forms a basis for further language development.

6. Pupil attitudes and motivation: Lambert (1973) suggests that attitudes toward oneself and the cultural group whose language is being learned are an important factor in language learning. One reaction to children's feeling unaccepted may be the development of negative attitudes toward the group which is felt to be rejecting them, which in turn may negatively influence language learning.

7. Parental attitudes: A bilingual-bicultural program may help parents to become more positive and supportive of their children's schooling because they feel that their language and culture are receiving official sanction and that the school is attempting to meet the individual needs of their children.

2.7 A Brief Overview of Bilingual Education and Some Related Problems

Troike (1978a) stated that half a billion dollars had been spent on bilingual education since the Bilingual Education Act was passed in 1968. According to a report in the APA Monitor (1977), 400 projects serving 260,000 children had been started. Of these, 68 languages were represented although 66 percent of the projects served Spanish-speaking children (e.g., Mexican-American, Cuban, and Puerto-Rican children). Gaarder (1975), however, suggested that as many as 80 percent of the programs served Spanish-speaking children.

Although there is much research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education in providing equal educational opportunity for minority pupils (see Troike, 1978a), a number of problems remain to be solved. One problem concerns the lack of an adequate definition of bilingual education and, as a possible consequence, the poor quality of some of the programs. Another major problem cited concerns the lack of importance attributed to hiring adequately prepared teachers and administrators who are literate in the non-English tongue and highly knowledgeable about the culture (Gaarder, 1975). Gaarder (op. cit.) cites examples of teachers who had never read a book in Spanish or who did not even know the Spanish alphabet. This can be the result of a number of conditions present initially, e.g., the limited funding available for teacher training, the lack of trained personnel, and the use of English as the main medium of instruction in many bilingual education programs for teacher training at colleges and universities.

Another problem has been the lack of good teaching materials. Troike (1978b) suggested that, despite the expenditure of millions of dollars, only a small amount of material had been developed and most of it was "amateurish and lacking in an organized design or research base." He also criticized the lack of involvement of linguists in developing materials. Although in some programs materials from the non-English-speaking country have been used, these have often been found to be too difficult for the children.

A major shortcoming of bilingual education has been its lack of research, both basic and operational, which is essential for program improvement. Troike (1978a) stated that of the total funds allocated to bilingual education, less than one-half of one percent had been spent on research; thus, there is little more research on which to base programs now than there was a decade ago. Furthermore, he points out the lack of agreed-upon standards and criteria for evaluation. When 150 evaluation reports were surveyed, it was found that only seven met minimal criteria for acceptance. Troike (op. cit.) and Tucker and d'Anglejan (1971) suggest a number of criteria which must minimally be included in future program evaluation. Swain (1978) also emphasizes the importance of supplementing psychometric data with other types of data in program evaluation.

3. BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE PRESCHOOL LEVEL

3.1 Introduction

With the preceding background in mind, a brief description will be given of a number of bilingual education programs for preschool children. One problem has been the difficulty of locating programs in early childhood bilingual education through the ERIC search (see also Escobedo, 1978). One reason for this may be that preschool programs are often only the first stage of bilingual programs continuing throughout the primary school grades and, thus, are not always reported separately. This suggests, however, the possibility that programs which are not reported in connection with long-term projects may be different from those which are in terms of the transition-maintenance issue. Another possible reason for the difficulty in locating programs is the relative newness of the area of bilingual education at the preschool level, which can be expected to be a natural maturation of the field of early childhood education as a whole. Increased recognition of the area of preschool bilingual-bicultural education can be expected in the future as a result of a national effort initiated by the federal government's Administration of Children, Youth, and Families to assist local Head Start Centers in implementing sound bilingual-bicultural programs (see Martinez, 1979). Four areas are being focused on: curriculum development, staff training, resources, and research and evaluation.

A source of references to programs for Spanish-speaking children is also contained in a research review and strategy paper by Padilla (1975). Thirty-five programs are listed, including information concerning objectives, type of evaluation, evaluation findings, distribution of the languages in teaching, materials and curriculum, teacher and aide quality, and parental involvement. Not all programs listed, however, are for preschool children alone.

The programs described in the following section are limited to total curriculum models rather than "curriculum guides" for teachers. The latter are not actual programs but, rather, lessons or units which teachers can use, each lesson consisting of e.g. objectives and activities for developing specific skills in preschool children. Some examples of such curriculum guides (in English and Spanish) are the following: *Bilingual Conceptual Development Guide - Preschool* (1970); the *Daily Curriculum Guide* (1976, 1977, 1978) and the *Bilingual-Bicultural Curriculum, Pre-Kindergarten* (1977).

The twenty programs located by the ERIC search are first summerized in table form. A second table classifies programs according to whether they are "one way" or "mixed," i.e., intended for minority children alone or for both majority and minority children. These results are briefly discussed, followed by a somewhat more detailed discussion of the areas of language training, teacher training, parental involvement, and resources. A short description of each program is also included in the appendix.

The programs are described in relation to the following dimensions:

GOAL OF PROGRAM

1. general developmental goals for preschool children
2. to compensate for a general lack of stimulation in the child's environment
3. to develop the mother tongue
4. to develop the second language
5. to enhance cognitive development and intellectual skills
6. to cultivate cultural awareness
7. to foster a positive identity
8. to develop perceptual and motor skills
9. to develop school readiness

DISTRIBUTION OF THE LANGUAGES

1. minority child in mainstream class with multiethnic educational focus
2. L2 used as the medium of instruction although minority children grouped together
3. mainstream classroom with L1 instruction several hours per week
4. mother tongue only
5. mother tongue with L2 instruction several hours per week
6. bilingual program, i.e., both languages used in equal proportion
7. bilingual program but L1 used only transitionally

STAFF

1. teacher(s) are monolingual L2-speaking
2. teacher(s) are monolingual L1-speaking
3. both L1- and L2-speaking teachers
4. bilingual teachers
5. L2-speaking teacher with bilingual aide
6. L2-speaking teacher with bilingual volunteer(s)
7. male teachers present

MATERIALS

1. traditional preschool materials used
2. special materials developed for program or for use with minority group children used

TEACHER TRAINING

1. teachers have normal preschool teacher training without special education or training for working with minority group children
2. teachers are not educated specifically to work with minority group children but have experience in working with this group
3. teachers are educated specifically to work with minority group children
4. teachers receive in-service education to work with minority group children

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

1. parents are not involved in program to any significant extent
2. parents attend meetings in the evening on a regular basis
3. parents involved directly in the classroom on a regular basis
4. parents involved indirectly in the program, e.g., fund-raising
5. parents involved in home visit programs, some classroom visits, etc.
6. simultaneous auxiliary activities for parents
7. parents involved in an advisory capacity

EVALUATION

1. no evaluation carried out
2. evaluation with regard to general program functioning
3. evaluation of effects of the program on children's language development
4. evaluation of effects of the program on children's cognitive development
5. evaluation of effects of the program on children's cultural awareness and identity
6. evaluation of effects of the program on children's social development and self-concept
7. evaluation of effects of the program on school readiness
8. evaluation of effects of the program on teacher attitudes
9. long-term evaluation is also being carried out

Table 1: A Description of Twenty Bilingual Educational Programs for Preschool Children

Program	Languages	Goal									Lang. Distrib						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Benjamin (1969)	Spanish/English				x	x											x
2. Adkins et al. (1970)	Hawaiian children speaking pidgin English				x							x					
3. Cornett et al. (1974)	Spanish/English			x	x	x		x								x	
4. Johnston (1968)	Samoan			x		x								x			
5. Askins et al. (1974)	Spanish/English	x	x	x	x	x		x								x	
6. Askins et al. (1975)	Spanish/English		x	x	x	x	x	x								x	
7. UMOS Child Center Project (1976)	Spanish/English	x	x	x	x		x									x	
8. Gunther (1976)	French/English Spanish/English				x	x	x	x	x	x							x
9. O'Farrell (1970)	Spanish/English	x		x	x		x	x									x
10. Quintanilla (1976)	Spanish/English				x		x	x				x					
11. Fishman (1975)	Italian/English			x	x	x	x	x	x	x						x	
12. TEEM (in Quillian & Rogers, 1972)	Spanish/English		x		x	x	x					x					
13. Bilingual Early Childhood Program (in Quillian & Rogers, 1972)	Spanish/English		x	x	x	x		x	x	x							x
14. Oral Language Program (in Quillian & Rogers, 1972)	Spanish/English				x							x					
15. North et al. (1969)	40 % Negro 40 % Spanish/English		x			x		x	x			x					
16. Teachers College (in Bilingual-Bicultural, 1977)	Spanish/English	x		x	x	x	x	x								x	
17. High/Scope (in Bilingual-Bicultural, 1977)	Spanish/English	x		x	x	x	x	x								x	
18. Santa Cruz (in Bilingual-Bicultural, 1977)	Spanish/English	x		x	x	x	x									x	
19. Amanecer (in Bilingual-Bicultural, 1977)	Spanish/English	x		x	x	x	x	x	x							x	
20. ECELS (1969)	Spanish/English		x	x	x	x	x	x	x								

Staff							Mat.		TT				Parents							Evaluation									Evaluation Results
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
		x						x				x	x									x							Twenty-six children using language lessons were better in English than children in a "free play" program.
x								x				x	x									x				x			Children participating in program significantly better than control group children on some language tests.
			x					x	not specified				x									x	x	x				x	Subjects in intervention program made significantly greater gains in mental ability and in English and greater gains in Spanish than control group subjects.
	x							x				x	x								x								Parents and children in pilot program responded enthusiastically to program and it was extended to 800 children.
			x					x			x	x					x					x			x	x			Children participating in program made significant gains in English, Spanish and school readiness.
			x					x				x					x					x	x		x	x		x	Students made significant gains in English, Spanish and school readiness. No significant gains in IQ. Positive gains in self-concept. Positive long-term effects.
			x			x		x			x			x			x		x			x	x						Summative research findings showed an improvement in cognitive and language development.
			x				x			x				x				x				x	x		x				Children's social skills, physical ability and intellectual ability improved to a significant degree and bilingual students developed positive self-concept. Program successful in involving parents.
			x				x					x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x									
				x				x		x			not specified									x					x			Children who attended program had a better command of English and better school attendance than those who did not.
			x			x		x			x	x		x	x			x	x		x	x		x		x		x	Pre-kindergarten children showed major gains in receptive language ability and cultural awareness.
x								x				x				x					x						x		Program significantly affected teacher attitudes and behavior in working with disadvantaged children in a positive manner.
			x					x				x		x								x	x						Program raised the intellectual level of disadvantaged children more than intervention through a parent involvement program or traditional nursery care program.
x								x				x	x									x							Children using the model made greater gains in language development than a control group of children.
x							x					x	x								x		x		x			x	Spanish-speaking children performed relatively poorly in all areas except mathematics and it was suggested than an ESL component and bilingual aids be added.
		x	x					x				x		x	x				x										Evaluation just begun.
		x	x					x				x			x														Evaluation just begun.
		x	x					x				x	x																Evaluation just begun.
		x	x					x				x			x														Evaluation just begun.
			x					x				x	x									x	x			x			Program children achieved significantly greater gains in IQ scores than children receiving intervention through a parent involvement program or a regular Head Start program.

Table 2: Classification of Programs As to Whether They Are One Way (for Minority Group Children Only) or Mixed (for Both Minority and Majority Group Children

	One Way	Mixed
Societal Language (ESL)	Adkins, 1970 Oral Language Program, 1972 Quintanilla, 1976 North, 1969	TEEM, 1972
Bilingual	Benjamin, 1969 Cornett et al., 1974 Johnston, 1968 Askins et al., 1974 Askins et al., 1975 UMOS Child Center Project, 1976 Fishman, 1975 Bilingual Early Childhood Program, 1972 ECELS, 1969 High/Scope, 1977 Amanecer, 1977 Gunther, 1976	O'Farrell, 1970 Teachers College, 1977 Santa Cruz, 1977

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Programs

Firstly, a number of different types of programs, in the broad sense, have been located by the ERIC search. Some have consisted of curriculum models developed, e.g., by consultant or regional governmentally-operated educational laboratories. These programs are often in the form of "curriculum packages" intended for implementation at local sites for large numbers of children, containing components for learning activities, teacher training, parental involvement and evaluation. In other cases, programs are descriptions of specific local efforts, usually for smaller numbers of children. The programs also vary according to their degree of structure; some are highly structured while others consist of guidelines or theoretical perspectives rather than being curricula as such.

Programs also differ along several other dimensions as well, e.g., whether they consist of specially designed language training lessons which are carried out in the context of a regular preschool program or are more "total" approaches aiming at improving the child's language and cognitive development as a whole and where language learning is integrated throughout the curriculum. If the latter is the goal, curricula may again vary widely

because they reflect distinct philosophies or assumptions about how children learn and develop. Escobedo (1978) classifies programs according to whether they reflect a maturationalist, cognitive developmentalist or experimentalist philosophy. For example, with regard to language teaching, programs of the first type may include only limited formal instruction, placing the emphasis instead on a teacher who is sensitive to the child's stage of development and who possesses a firm knowledge of syntactic structures, which the child is expected to imitate. In a cognitive developmentalist approach, more emphasis may be placed on general problem solving abilities rather than language learning per se. In an experimentalist approach more structured language learning may be provided in which the child may initially be reinforced, e.g., for producing correct syntactic patterns.

Models may also differ according to how the classroom is organized. Quillian and Rogers (1972) distinguish between open classroom, structured classroom, and individual instruction approaches. Finally, curriculum models based on specific educational philosophies can be expected to vary in the degree to which they are consistent with a highly teacher-directed or discovery-directed approach.

3.2.2 Language Group

As can be seen in Table 1, the majority of programs are for Spanish-speaking children. This is consistent with Gaarder's (1975) earlier mentioned finding that as a many as 80 percent of bilingual education programs serve Spanish-speaking children.

3.2.3 Goals

Table 1 shows that in only two of the twenty programs is language development the only area focused on. In three-fourths of the programs cognitive and intellectual development are also focused on, and in many programs other areas such as the child's self-concept, biculturalism, and school readiness are also mentioned as goals. This finding is consistent with the earlier description of the focus of bilingual education on lower income groups where language development may be only one of a number of areas needing support if the child is to benefit from subsequent learning experiences.

3.2.4 Distribution of the Languages

With regard to the distribution of the two languages, in five of the programs the second language (i.e., English) was the sole medium of instruction, although in all but one case minority children were grouped together. Thus, no cases were found where only one or two isolated children were integrated into a mainstream classroom. This may of course be due to the large numbers of minority children participating in bilingual education programs, large concentrations of minority group children in certain geographic areas, etc. It is surprising, however, that second language programs were included in the results from an ERIC search on bilingual programs, illustrating the lack of an adequate definition of bilingual education mentioned earlier which may cause some authors to include ESL programs under the heading of "bilingualism". Only one of the total programs was conducted entirely through the medium of the mother tongue, reflecting differences between approaches to educating minority group children in Sweden and in the United States. In approximately one-third of the bilingual programs the mother tongue was reported as being used only transitionally.

Table 2 (see p. 22) classifies the programs according to whether they are one-way or mixed. As can be seen, the majority of the programs are for minority children alone rather than for mixed groups of majority and minority children.

3.2.5 Staff

In four of the programs the teachers spoke only the second language and there is no reported use of a bilingual aide or volunteer. Over one-half of the programs, however, report the use of bilingual teachers or monolingual teachers speaking both languages. The use of bilingual teachers rather than volunteers or aides would appear to be beneficial with regard to increasing the status of the mother tongue. Only two of the programs report the involvement of male teachers.

3.2.6 Materials

The majority of the programs use materials which have been developed especially for the program. This may reflect the general lack of bilingual curriculum materials available for preschool children as well as the fact that some of the programs consisted of special curriculum packages or employed staff members who were curriculum writers.

3.2.7 Teacher Training

In the majority of cases the programs included some component of teacher training. This can be related to the lack of trained teachers in bilingual-bicultural preschool education, as well as to the fact that many of the curricula were highly structured and required teachers to be trained in using the specific concepts and methods which had been developed. An effort to improve the quality of teachers in preschool bilingual programs, the *Child Development Associate Program*, is described in the following section on teacher training.

3.2.8 Parental Involvement

In two-fifths of the programs, parents were not reported as being involved to any great extent. In one-fifth of the programs, however, parents were even involved in an advisory capacity. Head Start programs, especially, emphasized the involvement of parent representatives in the initial stages of program planning in order to ensure that the program reflected the needs of its participants as well as those of the surrounding community.

Parents in several of the programs were directly involved in working in the classroom and career development opportunities for parents in early childhood education were available in several cases. Several programs included home-visit components in order to follow up classroom work and support parents in working with their children at home. Staff members were employed specifically for this purpose, and in several cases mothers from the community were trained as home visitors. In three programs there were also auxiliary classes for mothers, e.g., in sewing and second language learning, in an adjoining classroom while the program was going on.

3.2.9 Evaluation

Although evaluation findings were not yet available for all of the programs, in only one case was no evaluation reported as being carried out. Evaluation mainly consisted of pre- and post-test measures of children's language development, intellectual development and school readiness, although in some cases an experimental/control group design was used. In four of the studies, a long-range evaluation was also being carried out. This is important considering the fact that one of the greatest difficulties in early intervention programs is in maintaining the effects of the program over time.

Evaluation instruments consisted more often of tests than, e.g., interviews and observations.

3.2.10 Evaluation Results

Table 1 shows that all of the programs, regardless of whether they were ESL or bilingual, seem to have had some positive effects on children's development. One problem, however, is in determining whether this is the result of the intervention itself or some other factor. One can also question to what extent negative results are reported in the literature. Another problem in comparing the benefits of an ESL versus bilingual program is that there are no studies reported in which comparable groups of children participating in both types of programs have been studied using the same methods.

The results seem to indicate, however, that, with regard to second language learning, some type of intervention geared specifically to the needs of the linguistic minority child is required. Thus, having a sympathetic teacher or participating in a program designed for disadvantaged children in general may not be sufficient to provide equal educational opportunity. This is supported by North (1969) who found that, although Negro children benefited greatly from an early intervention program for disadvantaged children, Spanish-speaking children performed relatively poorly in all measures except math. This resulted in the recommendation that an ESL component be added to the program. Benjamin (1969) reported that using language lessons resulted in a greater improvement in English in Spanish-speaking children than did a free play type of program. Quillian and Rogers (1972) reported that a structured bilingual early childhood program raised the intellectual level of disadvantaged children more than did intervention through a parent involvement program or a traditional nursery care program. This result would also seem to be dependent on the type of program being participated in by control group subjects, however, as well as on the skills and interests of teachers. Adkins et al. (1970) found for example that on some language measures control group subjects in some Head Start classes where teachers had focused on language development performed as well as subjects in the experimental group did.

3.3 *Language Instruction*

A number of packaged language programs are available for teachers both for second language and mother tongue teaching. Swedish home language teachers

of Spanish may especially be interested in these materials as the majority have been developed for the Spanish-speaking child. A sample of these materials is described briefly which may be of interest to teachers or linguists planning similar programs in Sweden. Following this is a brief discussion of some of the research findings concerning language training methods for preschool children.

3.3.1 Language Training Programs

Language Arts Supplement, Spanish (DeAvila & Duncan, 1977)

This material is the Spanish counterpart of an English collection of 100 games and activities designed to increase oral proficiency. The material contains no sentence or pattern drills but emphasizes learning through games. An active cultural heritage component is included. Minimal teacher support is required.

ESOL-SESD Guide: Kindergarten. Michigan Oral Language Series (Petrini, 1970)

This program is designed for teaching English to speakers of other languages or standard English to speakers of dialects at the kindergarten level. It consists of 135 half-hour lessons (to be used over a period of one year) presenting sentence patterns and vocabulary through kindergarten-like activities geared to children's conceptual and physical needs. The Spanish equivalent to the program appears in Soriano et al. (1970).

Mi Ambiente y Yo (My Environment and Me). An Aural-O al Activity Guide (Canales et al., 1973)

This tested aural-oral guide is a Spanish program for preschool and kindergarten children. It consists of a series of lessons around topics such as school, family, and pets, emphasizing vocabulary enrichment, syntactical drill patterns, pronunciation and intonation. Songs, games and folklore from the Spanish-American culture are used in the material.

Language through Literature: A Literary Language/Language Arts Program for Bilingual Education, ESL and other Activities in Early Childhood. Books 1 & 2 (King & King, 1972)

This language through literature program can be used as a native language program, a second language program or a combined program in early childhood education. The main part of the material consists of 130 lessons focused on

selections of childhood literature. The texts of the stories and related songs and games are written in English, Spanish, and Chinese with some samples available in French, German, Japanese and Portuguese. Daily lesson plans for teachers provide the structure necessary for language development.

3.3.2 Language Instruction Methods

Although it does not appear that a great deal of research has been carried out in the area of language training methods for preschool bilingual children, it is suggested that a more thorough search of the literature be carried out specifically investigating this most important area. Some of the results available at the present time are as follows.

A major question with regard to language training methods for preschool children concerns whether the second language should be taught as a separate subject or integrated throughout the curriculum.

One reason for integrating language learning throughout the program is that it is felt to increase motivation. Some researchers, however, suggest that language lessons can also be made meaningful to the child. Nedler and Lindfors (1971) describe one such method in which children were taught to deduce rules of the new language through exposure to sequenced and controlled input. In advocating the use of language lessons, however, they suggest that the child must have som expressive use of English before it is able to use language in cognitive areas. Other researchers, however, suggest that the child's competence in any language is a function of general thinking skills and that children must first learn about the world before they can talk about it.

Nedler (1975) reviews eight years of experience in developing second language teaching methods for young children. She found that using a naturalistic approach, i.e., having adults speak both languages to children without any special sequencing or structuring of vocabulary and syntax and expecting children to imitate did not work well. The Spanish-speaking children were unmotivated to speak English when they could be understood in Spanish. A similar result was found in families raising their children bilingually using a naturalistic method (see Arnberg, 1979, 1981). A subsequently used phonetic approach was found to be illogical in terms of how children learn language and also resulted in a fragmented vocabulary and little active communication. Ginsberg (1960) also suggests that due to children's remarkable

imitative capacity, phonetic development may be one area which does not require special training. In an adaptation of a programmed approach in which vocabulary, concepts and syntactic structures were controlled, there was no evidence of transfer, and the children became bored. Nedler (op. cit.) found that the most successful method was one in which children were actively involved in discovering underlying structures in the language.

Several writers emphasize the learning of sentences first and vocabulary later (Ginsberg, 1960; Nedler & Lindfors, 1971) so that the child can begin to communicate. Although complete forms may be presented first so that rules can be deduced, normal conversational, shorter forms should be used (Nedler & Lindfors, 1971). Choral repetition has been criticized because speaking in chorus is unnatural, distorts rhythm, and makes it difficult to listen to individual children.

Receptive learning is important through listening to games and stories (Dreher, 1971). This reinforces the language learning sequence of listening, discrimination, understanding, and speaking (see Howells, 1971). Padilla (1975) recommends the use of a variety of language activities in the classroom in order to reinforce the child's speech. Finally, it has been suggested that materials used to teach names be concrete, as pictures are abstract and thus difficult for young children to associate with concrete objects.

3.4 Teacher Training

Head Start programs for Spanish-speaking children attempt to use local community members as teachers in programs, but many are not trained in early childhood education, child development, bilingual-bicultural educational philosophy or teaching methods. In order to counteract this problem, in 1975, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families developed performance standards for Head Start policy with regard to the special needs of Spanish-speaking children, including a focus on staff training.

This work was a follow-up of earlier work to improve the quality of teachers in Head Start programs in general. In 1971 the Child Development Associate program was developed. The goal was to provide high quality training for classroom staff and, as a result, improve the quality of preschool programs for children. The CDA program consists of three components:

1) competencies
2) training
3) an assessment and credentialing system.

Both training and credentialing are based upon a set of compentencies that adults are judged to need in order to effectively work with young children. The CDA program has formed the basis for staff training programs for bilingual/bicultural teachers as well, although of course the scope of the basic program had to be expanded in certain areas. The program builds on the following competencies:

1) setting up a safe and healthy learning environment
2) advancing physical and intellectual competence
3) building a positive self-concept and individual strength
4) organizing and sustaining the positive functioning of children and adults in a group in a learning environment
5) bringing about an optimal coordination of home and center child-rearing practices and experiences
6) carrying out supplementary responsibilities related to children's programs
7) comprehending and communicating with children and adults in Spanish and English
8) supporting children's ethnic identity and self-concept by making cultural experiences an integral part of the daily program and supplementary activities.

Training programs at four universities were initially funded: Metropolitan State College, Our Lady of the Lake University, Texas A and I University, and Rutgers University. In addition, two trainer programs were developed for trainers of teachers in the CDA programs. Although the CDA competencies are used as a base, each program has developed its own unique curriculum based on the needs of the trainees and the characteristics of bilingualism/biculturalism in the particular population which it is serving. For curriculum descriptions of each of the six programs, the reader is referred to summaries presented in Martinez (1979) or in the conference proceedings from a Bilingual/Bicultural Preschool Projects Conference in 1977 in San Antonio, Texas (ED 168 688). Individual modules of each of the curricula are also described in detail and can be obtained from ERIC.

In addition to the CDA program, other suggestions concerning teacher training have appeared in the literature with regard to specific areas which need to be developed in potential teachers. Frequently recommended are the following:

1) a review of the basic principles of child development theory
2) philosophy of bilingual education

3) the richness of cultural diversity
4) the role of parents
5) the role of the community
6) human relations, i.e., an awareness of oneself and others
7) understanding the value systems of the child, and understanding family life, the culture and the teaching styles of parents
8) curriculum design

In addition, Campbell (1973) emphasizes the importance of teacher expectations and suggests that an important aspect of teacher training is attitude change.

3.5 Bilingual Education and the Home

Much of the American research in the area of bilingual education during the preschool years emphasizes the role of parents, either directly in the classroom or in auxiliary programs. The results from several programs have shown that in programs where children make the greatest gains, e.g., in language development, parents have been actively involved. One of the problems in early intervention such as Head Start is in maintaining the effects of the program. Parental involvement is thus one way in which long-term effects of programs may be facilitated.

A number of programs which have focused on some aspect of parental involvement in early childhood bilingual education will be described briefly. This will be followed by some recommendations for involving parents in bilingual education appearing in the literature.

3.5.1 Programs Emphasizing Some Aspect of Parental Involvement

A project in Santa Clara County, California (Bilingual Education Project, 1972) aims to: 1) demonstrate home teaching procedures designed to improve concept-formation and language development in 3-4-year-olds; 2) train women from the community as home teachers; and 3) give training to mothers in improving their teaching techniques with their own children. The program is for children from Spanish-speaking, low-income families. Children are first taught in Spanish but by the end of the year, instruction is approximately equally distributed in both languages. Parents are actively involved in the teaching sessions and helped to become more aware of what to teach the child, why, and how to use materials available in the home in teaching.

An interesting result of the project was an increased interest shown by parents in learning English. After one year in the program, children showed a marked improvement in concept and language development. There were also changes in mothers' attitudes, their upkeep of themselves and their homes, and the number of educational toys observed in the home.

Parten (1970) described a six-week training program for Mexican-American mothers, preparing them for working in the classroom. One motivation for the program was the observation that when Head Start began, although parents participated in activities outside the classroom, it was difficult to involve them directly in classroom work. This may have been related to parents' feelings of alienation from the school as well as their lack of understanding concerning their role in the classroom. The sessions included topics such as interacting with children, a typical day at a nursery school, art techniques, and role play in, e.g., reading stories to children. A librarian was involved in the program introducing Spanish books which later resulted in a special "Head Start shelf" being established at the local library. The program also provided continuing career opportunities for parents in early childhood education and one of the parents eventually became a bilingual teacher herself.

Cole et al. (1977) describes materials produced by a PAR *(Parents as Resources)* project directed by two professors and a social worker dedicated to helping parents work with their children during the preschool years. The material (in Spanish) utilizes materials available in the home and focuses on activities emphasizing math, reading, the development of communication skills, and motor coordination.

The *Child and Family Resource Program* (1975) is a Head Start affiliated program serving families over half of which are from Spanish-speaking backgrounds. In the educational component some of the program goals are to increase parents' awareness of the need for stimulating infants and toddlers, of their role as primary educators of their children, and to improve the home environment. Home visits are carried out twice a month in which teachers work with the child, parents and siblings in the home and a toy lending library has been established.

Quillian and Rogers (1972) describe the *Florida Parent Education Project* an intervention program for 1-3-year-old children from low-income families, which aims to break the poverty cycle by changing the home environment and

training mothers in stimulating their children's development at an early age. The program employs parent educators from the same population as mothers whom mothers find nonthreatening. The weekly visits involve the use of Piagetian tasks which the home visitor helps parents to understand and perform.

That parents, even those having only a limited education themselves, can be trained to be excellent teachers of their children is illustrated in a project for the children of migrant workers (McConnell, 1975). Due to the group's mobility, it was found that parents were the most stable adult figures in the children's lives. A program was developed in which all teaching was carried out by parents and where a back-up team of professional teachers provided teacher training, curriculum planning, and materials. Teacher training used a micro-teaching technique, involved parents at once in teaching and was directly related to curriculum goals. The teachers' manual was adapted to the language and understanding level of the parents. The results showed that the program provided a significant educational advantage for children and that after 200 days in the program, 3-5-year-olds had acquired preschool concepts to a significantly greater degree than had the norm group.

In an effort to coordinate home and school activities, a *Parent and Child Education Project* (PACE) in Tuscon, Arizona (see Learning: A Cooperative Adventure, 1975) developed a curriculum booklet which suggests coordinated home and school activities in three areas: the child, the child and the immediate environment, and the child and special skills. Lists of goals, five home activities and five related school activities are included, as well as suggestions concerning ways in which teachers can facilitate parental involvement in the home and school, e.g.:

1) having a place in the classroom for displaying materials which relate to the needs and interests of parents
2) displaying a new toy bimonthly and how to use it
3) displaying crafts made by parents
4) displaying library materials which can be checked out
5) having a suggestion box available
6) learning the language, culture and history of the minority group (or at least learning to correctly pronounce parents' and children's names)
7) learning what skills parents have and how these can be incorporated in the classroom.

3.5.2 Recommendations for Parental Involvement from the Literature

3.5.2.1 Collecting Background Information from Parents

In order to work effectively with parents, it is suggested that information first be collected from each family including, e.g., the language used in the home, parental attitudes toward preschool education, parents' achievement motivation, needs and interests, and child rearing patterns (see Saville-Troike, 1978, for a guide to questions to ask about cultural background).

3.5.2.2 Auxiliary Courses for Parents

Courses for parents held in conjunction with the program can cover topics such as the following:

1) an overview of the program
2) the role of parents in the classroom
3) developing parent service groups for the preschool
4) making materials for the classroom, e.g., toy workshops
5) language development in the home
6) good books for parents and children
7) activities to do at home with children such as dramatic art, nature studies, visits to places of importance in the community such as the post office, library and supermarket and talking about what was seen
8) places to go with the family at little cost
9) how to use resources and services in the community
10) health and nutrition, home economics, consumer issues, first aid, housing and tenant rights
11) second language instruction
12) personal development

It is useful to designate a special parents' room as part of the program where courses can be held and where parents can meet.

3.5.2.3 Newsletters

Monthly newsletters, written in the parents' language can also be used for communication. These can contain information about the program, suggestions for activities at home, something relevant interesting to read to the child and even research findings, written in a form that parents will understand.

3.5.2.4 Parental Involvement in the Classroom

The involvement of parents directly in the classroom is a great asset as it can increase the range of activities available to children as well as increase the adult to child ratio. Parent participation, however, requires that parents be given some type of initial training. Parents can teach activities related to the minority culture, e.g., story telling, songs and dances, craftwork, and cooking. Andersson (1975) also suggests the use of grandparents as a source of traditional folk materials and older children as tutors.

3.6 Resources and Resource Centers

The development of resources, both in terms of written documents for teachers as well as regional centers providing assistance to local programs and teachers, is an important aspect of bilingual education.

Resource documents which describe, e.g., the language learning process, bilingualism/second language learning in children, and the minority culture, and which contain listings of common phrases in the minority language and their translations as well as bibliographies of teaching materials for specific minority groups are highly useful to teachers. An example of such a document is *Bilingual Children: A Resource Document* (Saville-Troike, 1973) published by the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Regional centers for assisting local bilingual-bicultural programs for preschool children have been established in areas having high concentrations of minority groups as part of the national Head Start effort. These centers provide human and material resources for helping programs to get started, including:

1) bilingual-bicultural early childhood materials which can be borrowed from the center, e.g., training manuals, children's books, records, tapes, curriculum guides, instruction kits, etc.
2) technical assistance in implementing programs
3) inservice training in the use of materials

In an evaluation of the effects of such resource centers, a positive correlation was found between a high degree of cooperation with the centers and program quality (Bilingual/Bicultural Preschool Projects Conference, 1977).

In addition, a Title VII Network provides assistance to bilingual school programs. According to information from the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, the need for assistance has arisen from the fact that, since 1968, funds for bilingual-bicultural education have been allocated to local education authorities who often lacked experience in bilingual-bicultural education:

> Due to the inexperience of educators in this country as well as the vagueness inherent in the Act itself, the lack of appropriate materials in non-English languages, and the need for trained bilingual teachers, a diverse network of regional centers was established in fiscal year 1975 to provide local school districts with experts in this field to train teachers, provide consultants in various subject areas of expertise, and produce and distribute materials to the Local Education Agencies. In addition, State Education Agencies have been receiving funds to help in technical assistance areas since 1974 (Bilingual Education Information Packet, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education).

The network consists of the following centers:

1) Training Resource Centers (19) which provide training and technical assistance to teachers, aides, and administrative personnel

2) Materials Development Centers (17) which develop materials for bilingual programs as a result of the lack of bilingual and bicultural materials available for American students

3) Dissemination and Assessment Centers (3) which reproduce materials produced by the MDCs (see above) on a large scale and disseminate them

4) National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education which collects, analyzes and disseminates information for and about bilingual education and bilingual education programs to all those interested.

4. DISCUSSION

The present literature study has focused on a number of areas which are of interest in the bilingual educational planning for immigrant children in Sweden. Although the results from specific programs are highly difficult to generalize to other settings where factors such as attitudes, socio-economic background, cultural patterns and languages may differ widely, a number of central themes have appeared in the literature. The following discussion gives an account of where research stands in relation to these areas, which can be useful in further program development.

4.1 The Importance of Considering Background Factors in Program Development

In addition to developing pedagogically, developmentally, and linguistically sound programs and learning materials for bilingual children, such programs and materials must reflect the needs and interests of the children and families they are serving. It is suggested that more research is needed concerning background factors in individual immigrant groups in order to design programs which are optimally related to children's growth. Padilla (1975), e.g., suggested that lower class Mexican-American children had a culturally bound cognitive learning style which was different from that of their Anglo peers. This research led to the development of programs which supported the learning style of Mexican-American children, at the same time exposing them to the contrasting learning style encouraged in the school. Other studies have shown that cultural patterns in specific immigrant groups may not encourage certain types of behavior expected of children in the preschool, leading to different and incompatible expectations of teachers and parents which may interfere with children's academic success. As an example, Pheiffer (1975) found that Navajo children were taught to observe and listen rather than to verbalize, to avoid eye contact as it showed a lack of respect, and to avoid competition.

In general, Swedish research has focused mainly on linguistic factors in developing educational programs for immigrant children. Although the literature unequivocally supports the use of the child's mother tongue in educational programs, especially during the early years, the ways in which the two languages are used can vary widely. It is thus important to identify other factors which may also be contributing to the results of a particular program, e.g., children's learning styles, the lack of representation of the children's culture and earlier experiences in the classroom, attitudes of

personnel and other children toward specific ethnic groups, etc., in order to achieve greater flexibility in educational planning for individual groups which may differ widely with regard to the degree of proficiency in the two languages as well as in their aspirations for bilingualism. One difficulty mentioned frequently in the literature with regard to individualizing program planning, however, concerns the lack of adequate assessment instruments for measuring language and cognitive development in young bilingual children.

In addition to investigating background factors such as the above, it would be highly useful to specify, in terms of educational objectives, what skills are necessary in order for the child to benefit from the preschool setting. In this way, specific areas which need to be developed could be focused on, and, with the form of teacher checklists, the child's progress could be monitored.

4.2 Factors Related to Language Learning

4.2.1 Mixed or Non-Mixed Groups of Majority and Minority Children

One factor related to language learning concerns the extent to which educational programs for linguistic minority group children should be one way (for linguistic minority group children alone) or mixed (for both majority and minority group children). The present literature investigation has shown that most programs are of the one way variety. Only three programs of the mixed variety were found and evaluation findings were not available for two of these. It is thus difficult, on the basis of the present findings, to make any conclusive statements regarding the advantages or disadvantages of one way versus mixed models.

With regard to the encouragement of societal bilingualism and cultural pluralism, Fishman (1977) suggests the importance of mixed models. Majority children, if exposed to a second language and culture at an early age, may develop positive attitudes toward the minority group and toward bilingualism. Fillmore (1977) also warns about the problems which can arise when the "bilingual" class, composed only of minority children, is isolated from the rest of the school.

When considering language learning, there may also be advantages for a mixed model. Rees and Fitzpatrick (undated mimeo) suggest the importance of an interaction with native speakers in second language learning. At

certain ages, immigrant children may be more motivated to learn the second language from peers than from adults. One argument against mixed groups, however, is that teachers may pace themselves to the quickest children (Campbell, 1973).

One must also consider the goal of the program, however, in decisions concerning mixed or one way models, e.g., whether it is to enhance the learning of the majority language or the mother tongue. Although mixed groups may lead to the learning of the societal language more quickly, this language may soon dominate, especially when majority children have only limited skills in the second language. The choice of a mixed or a one way model is also related to the degree of bilingualism in individual children and the opportunities for learning both languages in the child's wider environment.

4.2.2 Sequential or Simultaneous Presentation of the Languages

Another language-related question concerns whether it is easier for the bilingual child to learn two languages when learning occurs sequentially or simultaneously. One difficulty here is in defining what is meant by "sequential" and "simultaneous." Although in most of the programs reviewed, children were first taught concepts in the native language, the introduction of the second language could vary from presentation later the same day to several months later, and, as is the case in Sweden, even several years later. A problem in answering the question regarding sequential or simultaneous presentation also concerns the lack of knowledge concerning how the learning of a second language influences the learning of a first while the first is still in the process of being acquired. Does sequential or simultaneous presentation retard, assist or influence bilingual acquisition?

There is much support in the literature for the fact that young children can learn two languages simultaneously. Much of this evidence comes from natural bilingual acquisition studies, i.e., cases in which children have been exposed to two languages in the home (see Arnberg, 1981 and McLaughlin, 1978 for reviews of this literature). As both authors point out, however, in much of the case study literature conditions for bilingual acquisition have been highly favorable. Mackey (1971) also suggests that a language alteration model, i.e., simultaneous presentation, may only work if the child is secure in one of the languages. If the child is linguistically, emotionally or intellectually unprepared it may be better to strengthen one of the languages first before the second language is introduced. This

has been one of the main reasons supporting the exclusive use of the mother tongue during the early years in programs for immigrant children in Sweden, i.e., the child is not yet secure in the use of the mother tongue. The above results seem to indicate the need for further studies in which the simultaneous learning of two languages in both the home and preschool settings is studied among children from a variety of linguistic backgrounds.

If the languages are presented simultaneously, another question concerns whether they should be consistently separated as to person, location, time of day, etc. in order to minimize confusion. Although the case study literature generally supports a physical separation of the languages, this question has received only minimal empirical investigation, particularly in the school setting (see Castillejo, 1933). There may also be advantages for an adult's speaking two languages to the child, e.g., children may learn at an early age that it is natural to speak two languages and thus develop a positive attitude toward bilingualism (Aronsson & Wigforss, 1974).

The discussion of mixing or separation of the languages is also important to consider in relation to the child's concept formation. Do concepts become clearer when they are expressed in more than one language (depending of course on the child's degree of proficiency in each language)? With regard to the transfer of concepts from one language to another, Wilson (1970) suggests that transfer may occur more rapidly if the second language is introduced as soon as possible following the first.

4.2.3 Integrated Language Learning or Special Language Lessons

Finally, an important question mentioned earlier concerns whether language learning should be integrated throughout the curriculum or presented in the form of special language lessons. The question posed in this way is somewhat unclear as there are several dimensions involved which may or may not be represented in either alternative. For example, "language lessons" do not necessarily need to consist of isolated drills or pattern practice but can be based on kindergarten like activities as well as incorporate aspects of the minority culture. Similarly, "integrated language learning" can vary from being highly structured to mere exposure of the child to the second language through play. A number of questions are thus implied: 1) Is sequencing of language input more beneficial to learning than mere exposure? 2) Is motivation increased when language is taught through interesting subject matter rather than for itself? 3) Is language learning enhanced when

it is integrated throughout the curriculum? 4) What is the relationship between the degree of proficiency in the second language and language teaching methods?

Several studies have suggested that a second language is not "caught" by mere exposure but requires a sequential and systematic presentation of structural elements. In the review of studies presented earlier (see, e.g., North, 1969) the importance of gearing programs to the special language needs of the linguistic minority child was recognized. There is also some support for the fact that language learning, especially for young children, is more meaningful when presented through content material rather than by means of patterns and drills (Ginsberg, 1969; Ramirez & Liberty, 1973; Rivers, 1975). Nedler and Lindfors (1971), however, suggest that children can be highly motivated when language lessons are used when they are actively involved in discovering underlying structures in the language. Thus, the disadvantages attributed to language lessons may be that they have often been associated with rote learning. Language learning which is integrated throughout the curriculum also appears to be beneficial because patterns and concepts can be practiced in a variety of modalities.

Finally, children at various stages of second language proficiency may benefit from different types of instruction. Krashen (1981) suggests that second language classrooms are excellent places to acquire second language skills at the beginning and low intermediate levels because they supply input which is not always available from the "outside" world. At later stages of proficiency, however, when students are ready to improve on their own, structured language lessons may be less important. The extent to which Krashen's suggestions are applicable to language learning in young children, however, has not been established.

4.3 Parental Involvement in Bilingual Education Programs

Parental involvement in bilingual education has been seen as being highly important in many of the programs reviewed, reflecting the importance attributed to the close relationship between community and schooling in the United States. One difficulty in increasing parental involvement in Swedish programs, however, concerns the fact that many immigrant mothers

are employed outside the home. Although this may well be the case, a greater emphasis on parental involvement in programs for linguistic minority children is nevertheless indicated for several reasons: 1) not all immigrant parents work outside the home, at least on a full-time basis; 2) due to the lack of input in the native language, immigrant parents are highly important sources of language input and must be helped in understanding the importance of their role as teachers; 3) parental involvement need not only pertain to classroom visits; there are other ways in which parents can be involved in programs, which may help to meet their own needs as well as those of their children.

In discussing the issue of parental involvement, it is useful to distinguish between involvement which benefits parents themselves (and as a result, children), that which benefits children directly, and that which benefits bilingual programs. The importance of the first area has perhaps been overlooked to some extent in Sweden. An important area for further work concerns the development of methods for alleviating the sense of alienation which many immigrant parents may experience in relation to the preschool. This may be a result of factors such as attitudes toward the dominant culture, cultural background, lack of knowledge about the preschool, lack of language proficiency in the societal language, educational background, etc. Through greater involvement in preschool programs, as well as through seeing that the preschool demonstrates an active interest in their own cultural group, parents may develop more positive attitudes toward the dominant society, increased self-esteem, and a more positive view of themselves as effective change agents. This in turn can be expected to positively influence their children's school performance, attitudes and motivation.

The literature study has illustrated that methods such as the following are important in involving parents in preschool programs:

1) Communicating to parents via paraprofessionals or home language teachers the importance of bilingualism (i.e., parents' supporting their children's native language development as well as parents' learning the societal language themselves)

2) Providing means of learning the societal language and other skills necessary to function in the new society in a form meaningful to parents (e.g., combining second language learning with cooking, sewing, discussions concerning consumer issues, etc.)

3) Providing information to parents about the preschool in their own language

4) Generally considering parents' views, attitudes and wishes regarding the program to as great an extent as possible

5) Involving parents in policy decisions regarding the preschool

6) Increasing career opportunities for parents in the preschool, e.g., as bilingual aides

Another important area is in developing methods to support parents in their role as teachers of their children. Parental involvement in classrooms can benefit children because by observing teachers and the way in which children learn in school, parents can become aware of ways in which they can help their children learn. Home visit programs using paraprofessionals from the minority group community who parents do not find threatening and who demonstrate ways in which parents can stimulate their children's growth in the home have also produced positive results in many cases. Jayne (1976), describing one such program, suggests that parents are not uninterested in their children's development but often lack skills and knowledge concerning how they can positively influence their children's growth.

The literature has repeatedly shown that parents, if given appropriate training, can greatly increase the quality of programs and can even themselves be responsible for teaching (McConnell, 1975). Parents can greatly enrich the curriculum by teaching crafts, cooking, folkdancing, etc. related to the minority culture, and the use of parents in this way demonstrates an effective way to utilize the resources available in the community. Even grandparents can be involved in the program, e.g., in storytelling, thereby increasing their sense of usefulness as well as exposing children to a purer form of the language. Furthermore, the involvement of parents increases the adult-child ratio, offering the child greater opportunity for language training. This may be especially important in classrooms where a number of different immigrant groups are represented and where home language teachers may not be available. This solution was observed in a kindergarten program in Australia and was judged by staff to be highly successful.

4.4 Local versus Central Support for Teacher Training, Materials Development and Dissemination

The literature survey has emphasized the importance of teacher training in which teachers, both bilingual and monolingual, are trained to meet the special needs of immigrant children. Especially in relation to continuing

education, the question arises concerning who should provide this education. One suggestion in the literature has been the development of a network of regional centers providing services in the areas of teacher training, materials development, dissemination of materials, and assistance in evaluation. Another solution is to provide such support locally. In England, e.g., multiethnic affairs officers are employed in local school districts who coordinate efforts at local teachers' centers in arranging courses for teachers, holding curriculum development workshops, discussing multiethnic issues in teaching, etc.

4.6 The Importance of Program Evaluation

Troike (1978a) emphasizes the importance of evaluation for program improvement. In general, with regard to preschool programs for bilingual children in Sweden, only minimal evaluation has been carried out so that little is known concerning the effects of different educational models on children's language, cognitive and social development. One problem in evaluating programs has been the lack of clearly articulated and measurable program objectives as well as the availability of assessment instruments for determining whether these objectives have been met.

One of the most interesting results from the present study has been that most intervention programs, whether these involve second language, mother tongue, or bilingual approaches have all had positive effects on children's development. This illustrates the fact that there may be a variety of approaches to solving the problems of the linguistic minority child and that the advantages and disadvantages of each must be assessed. It also raises the question, however, concerning whether positive findings are actually the result of the intervention itself. In relation to this question, Cronbach (1969) states the following:

> In an educational experiment it is difficult to keep pupils unaware that they are in an experimental group. It is thus never certain whether any observed advantage is attributable to the educational innovation as such, or to the greater energy that teachers and students put forth when a method is fresh and "experimental".

This illustrates the importance of using control/experimental group designs in which all subjects undergo the same type of treatment and where only the language factor is varied. An alternative is to use designs in which comparable groups receiving different educational treatments are compared with one another.

Several authors have also pointed out the importance of changes in the family and community as a result of bilingual education programs in addition to those in the child. Although factors such as a new "lease on life" and an increased cohesiveness in the community may be highly difficult to measure, they may be equally important results of bilingual education programs as direct benefits to children.

REFERENCES

Adkins, D.C. et al. (1970). *Iterative research in curriculum development: A preschool language module.* A section of the final report for 1969-70. Honolulu: Hawaii Univ. (ED 055 483).

Andersson, T. (1975). Extending bilingual education into the home. *Foreign Language Annals, 8,* 302-305.

Arnberg, L. (1979). Language strategies in mixed nationality families. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 20,* 105-112.

Arnberg, L. (1981) *A longitudinal study of language development in four young children exposed to English and Swedish in the home.* (Linköping Studies in Education, Report No. 6.) Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University.

Arnberg, L. (1982). *Bilingual education of young children in England and Wales.* Linköping University, Report LiU-PEK-R-73.

Aronsson, K. & Wigforss, E. (1974). *Den tvåspråkiga lekskolan i Malmö 1973-74.* Report from the Inst. of Educ. No. 53. Univ. of Lund.

Askins, B.E. et al. (1974). *Clovis-Portales bilingual early childhood program.* Second Year Evaluation Study. Lubbock, Tex.: Adobe Educ. Services; New Mexico: Clovis Public Schools (ED 103 108).

Askins, B.E. et al. (1975). *Responsive environment program for Spanish American children.* Fourth Year Evaluation Study. Final Evaluation Report 1974-1975. New Mexico: Clovis Public Schools (ED 111 562).

Benjamin, R.C. (1969). A bilingual oral language and conceptual development program for Spanish-speaking pre-school children. *TESOL Quarterly, 3,* 315-319.

Bilingual-Bicultural Curriculum, Pre-Kindergarten. (1977). Connecticut Migratory Children's Program. Hamden: Connecticut Staff Development Cooperative; New Haven: Connecticut State Migratory Children's Program; Hamden-New Haven Cooperative Educ. Center (ED 139 288).

Bilingual-Bicultural Preschool Projects Conference. (1977). Conference Proceedings. San Antonio, Texas, Nov. 15-18 (ED 168 688).

Bilingual Conceptual Development Guide, Preschool. (1970). Michigan Oral Language Series. New York City: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages; Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education (ED 039 818).

Bilingual Education Project, Santa Clara County. (1972). Final Report. San Jose, Ca.: Santa Clara County Office of Education (ED 067 182).

Campbell, R.N. (1973). Bilingual education for Mexican-American children in California. In Turner, P.R. (Ed.), *Bilingualism in the Southwest.* Tuscon: Univ. of Arizona Press.

Canales, E. et al. (1973). *Mi ambiente y yo: An aural-oral activity guide.* Texas: Corpus Christi Independent School District; Austin, Texas: Dissemination Center for Bilingual-Bicultural Education (ED 108 504).

Carrow, E. (1971). Comprehension of English and Spanish by preschool Mexican-American children. *Modern Language Journal, 55*, 299-305.

Carrow, Sister M.A. (1957). Linguistic functioning of bilingual and monolingual children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 22*, 371-380.

Castillejo, J. (1933). Modern Languages in an international school. *The New Era, 14*, 7-10.

Child and Family Resource Program (Gering, Nebraska) (1975). Program Description. Washington, D.C.: Development Associates, Inc. (ED 121 437).

Christian, C. (1977). Minority language skills before age three. In Mackey, W.F. & Andersson, T. (Eds.) *Bilingualism in early childhood.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Cole, A. et al. (1977). *Recipes for fun: Activities which can be done at home with young children.* Prepared by Parents as Resources (PAR), Northfield, Ill. (ED 149 919).

Cornett, J.D., Ainsworth, L. & Askins, B. (1974). Effect of an intervention program on "high risk" Spanish American children. *Journal of Educ. Research, 67*, 342-343.

Cronbach, L.J. (1969) Evaluation for course improvement. In Anderson, Faust, Roderick, Cunningham & Andre (Eds.) *Current research on instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Daily Curriculum Guide, Year II, Weeks 1-10. (1976). *A preschool program for the Spanish-Speaking child.* Austin, Texas: Dissem & Assess. Center for Bilingual Education; San Jose, Ca.: Spanish Dame Bilingual-Bicultural Project (ED 164 212).

Daily Curriculum Guide, Year II, Weeks 11-20. (1977). (ED 164 213).

Daily Curriculum Guide, Year II, Weeks 21-34. (1978). (ED 164 214).

De Avila, E.A. & Duncan, S.E. (1977). *Language arts supplement, Spanish* (revised ed.). Corte Madera, Ca.: Linguametrics Group, Inc. (ED 154 643).

DiPietro, R.J. (1978). Culture and ethnicity in the bilingual classroom. In Alatis, J.E. (Ed.), *Georgetown Univ. Round Table on Languages & Linguistics.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Dreher, B.B. (1971). Language training in a preschool for Spanish-speaking migrant children. *Speech Teacher, 20*, 64-65.

Early Childhood Education Learning System (ECELS) (1969). San Antonio Urban Educational Development Center. 1968-69 Final Evaluation Report. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Lab. (ED 041 625).

Edwards, J.R. (1980). Critics and criticisms of bilingual education. *Modern Language Journal, 64*, 409-415.

Edwards, J.R. (1981). The context of bilingual education. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 2*, 25-44.

Escobedo, T.H. (1978). *Culturally responsive early childhood education programs for non-English speaking children.* California State University, Los Angeles. National Dissemination and Assessment Center (ED 161 277).

Fillmore, L.W. (1977). *Dimensions of bilingual programs and some problems.* Paper presented at the Conference on Dimensions in Bilingual Education, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Feb. 14-15, Washington, D.C.

Fishman, J.A. (1977). Bilingual education for the children of migrant workers: The adaptation of general models to a new specific challenge. In De Grève, M. & Rossell, E. (Eds.) *Problèmes linguistiques des enfants de travailleurs migrants.* 10e Colloque de l'AIMAV en collaboration avec la Commission des Communautés Européennes. Brussels: AIMAV, Didier, pp. 97-105.

Fishman, J.A. & Lovas, J. (1970). Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 3,* 215-222.

Fishman, S. (1975). *Designing and implementing an early childhood Italian bilingual-bicultural education program.* Cedarhurst, N.Y.: Lawrence Public Schools (ED 125 738).

Gaarder, A.B. (1975). Bilingual education: Central questions and concerns. *New York University Educational Quarterly, 41,* 2-6.

Garcia, E.E. (1980). Bilingualism in early childhood. *Young Children, 35,* 52-66.

Ginsberg, U.S. (1960). An experiment in teaching pre-school children a foreign language. *Sovetskaia Pedagogika, 2,* 18-25.

González, J.M. (1975). Coming of age in bilingual-bicultural education: A historical perspective. *Inequality in Education, 19,* 5-17.

Gunther, P.E. (1976). *Basic skills after school pre-kindergarten program, 1975-76.* New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, New York, Office of Educational Evaluation (ED 141 476).

Herbert, W. (1977). Bilingual education missing the mark? *APA Monitor,* September/October.

Higham, J. (1975). *Send these to me.* New York: Atheneum.

Howells, S. (1971). The preschool migrant child. *Education News, 13,* 9-14.

Jayne, E. (1976). *Deptford educational home visiting project.* Inner London Education Authority: Research and Statistics Group, RS 645.

Johannesson, I. (1975). Bilingual-bicultural education of immigrant children in Sweden. *International Review of Education, 21,* 347-355.

Johnston, B. (1968). *Early childhood education in American Samoa.* American Samoa Department of Education, Pago Pago (ED 032 114).

King, P. & King, E. (1972). *Language through literature: A literary language/language arts program for bilingual education, ESL, and other activities in early childhood.* (Unpublished curriculum guide) (ED 083 619).

Kjolseth, R. (1972). Bilingual education programs in the United States: for assimilation or pluralism? In Spolsky, B. (Ed.), *The language education of minority children.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury.

Krashen, S.D. (1981). The "fundamental pedagogical principle" in second language teaching. *Studia Linguistica, 35,* 50-70.

Lambert, W.E. (1973). *Culture and language as factors in learning and education.* Paper presented at the 5th Annual Learning Symposium on "Cultural Factors in Learning" at Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington.

Learning: A Cooperative Adventure: A Resource Guide for Working with Young Children (1975). Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Education (ED 119 868).

Löfgren, H. (1981). *Modersmålsklasser eller sammansatta klasser för barn till invandrare.* Pedagogiska uppsatser 6. Lunds Universitet.

Mackey, W.F. (1971). *Free language alternation in early childhood bilingualism.* Paper presented at the Conference on Child Language, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 22-24 (ED 060 755).

Mackey, W.F. (1972). A typology of bilingual education. In Fishman, J.A. (Ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language II.* The Hague: Mouton, 413-432.

Macnamara, J. (1972). Perspectives on bilingual education in Canada. *The Canadian Psychologist, 13,* 341-349.

Martinez, K.A. (1979). *Overview of four bilingual-bicultural training programs and two bilingual-bicultural CDA trainer programs.* Washington, D.C.: Inter America Research Ass. (ED 182 028).

McConnell, B. (1975). *Training migrant paraprofessionals in bilingual mini Head Start.* Final Evaluation, 1974-75 program year. Progress Report No. 7. Ephrata: Washington State Intermediate School District 104 (ED 114 222).

McLaughlin, B. (1978). *Second-language acquisition in childhood.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Meyerson, M.D. (1969). The bilingual child. *Childhood Education, 45,* 525-527.

Miranda, C. et al. (1968). *A bilingual oral language and conceptual development program for Spanish-speaking preschool children.* Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State Department of Education (ED 034 568).

Moore, O.K. (1964). Autotelic responsive environments for learning. In Gross, R. & Murphy, J., *The revolution in the schools.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (1980). Foreword, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T., *Language in the process of cultural assimilation and structural incorporation of linguistic minorities.*

National Institute of Education (1975). *Spanish-English bilingual education in the United States: Current issues, resources and recommended funding priorities for research.* Manuscript.

Nedler, S. (1975). Explorations in teaching English as a second language. *Young Children, 30*, 480-488.

Nedler, S. & Lindfors, J. (1971). *Bilingual learning for the Spanish speaking preschool child.* Paper presented at the Conference on Child Language, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 22-24 (ED 060 746).

North, R.D. et al. (1969). *Pre-kindergarten program 1968-69.* Evaluation report for the project. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New York City Board of Educ.; New York City: Psychological Corp. (ED 038 511).

O'Farrell, B. (1970). *A study in child care.* (Case study from Volume II-A): "Tacos & Tulips" Day Care Programs Reprint Series (ED 051 893).

Padilla, A.M. et al. (1975). *Preschool bilingual/bicultural education for Spanish-speaking/surnamed children: A research review and strategy paper.* California University, Los Angeles: Spanish-speaking Mental Health Research and Development Program (ED 122 927).

Parten, C.B. (1970). A training program for volunteers. *Young Children, 26*, 27-33.

Paulston, C.B. (1975). Ethnic relations and bilingual education: accounting for contradictory data. In Troike, R.C. & Modiano, N. (Eds.), *Proceedinge of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education*, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Paulston, C.B. (1978). Education in a bi/multilingual setting. *International Review of Education, 24*, 309-328.

Petrini, A.M. (1970). *ESOL-SESD guide: Kindergarten.* Michigan Oral Language Series. New York City: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages; Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education (ED 039 817).

Pfeiffer, A.B. (1975). Designing a bilingual curriculum. In Troike, R.C. & Modiano, N. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education*, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Quillian, B.F. Jr. & Rogers, K.S. (1972). *Nine model programs for young children. Program summaries for potential implementation.* Vol I. St. Ann, Mo.: National Coordination Center for Early Childhood Education (ED 129 402).

Quintanilla, G. (1976). *The "little school of the 400."* (ED 158 905).

Ramirez, M. & Castañeda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy, bicognitive development and education.* New York: Academic Press.

Ramirez, A.R. & Liberty, P.G. Jr. (1973). *An evaluative study of instructional strategies and pupil cognitive learning in an English as a second language program of a Spanish-English bilingual education project.* Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, Feb. 25 - March 1 (ED 075 504).

Ravitch, D. (1976). On the history of minority group education in the United States. *Teachers College Record, 78*, 213-228.

Rees, O.A. & Fitzpatrick, F. (undated). *Mother tongue and English teaching project.* Summary of the Report - Volumes I & II. Bradford University and Bradford College, Great Britain.

Rivers, W.M. (1975). Motivation in bilingual programs. In Troike, R.C. & Modiano, N. (EDS.), *Proceedings of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education*, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Roeming, R. (1970). Bilingualism and the national interest. *Georgetown University Monographs on Languages & Linguistics*, 371-74.

Saville, M. & Troike, R. (1973). *Handbook of bilingual education*. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Saville-Troike, M. (1973). *Bilingual children: A resource document*. Paper in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series. Center for Applied Linguistics (ED 102 867)

Saville-Troike, M. (1978). *A guide to culture in the classroom*. National Clearinghouse for bilingual education.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Tvåspråkighet*. Lund: Liber Läromedel.

Soriano, J.M. et al. (1970). *Spanish guide, kindergarten*. Michigan Oral Language Series. New York City: American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages. Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education (ED 039 824).

Swain, M. (1978). School reform through bilingual education: problems and some solutions in evaluating programs. *Comparative Education Review, 22*, 420-433.

Tosi, A. (1979). Mother-tongue teaching for the children of migrants. *Language Teaching & Linguistics: Abstracts*, October, 213-231.

Tosi, A. (1981). Between the mother's dialect and English. In Davies, A. (Ed.), *Language and learning at school and home*. Heinemann.

Troike, R.C. (1978). Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. *NABE Journal, 3*, 13-24 (a).

Troike, R.C. (1978). Bilingual education in the United States: The first decade. *International Review of Education, 24*, 401-405 (b).

Tucker, G.R. (1974). Methods of second-language teaching. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*, 102-107.

Tucker, G.R. (1977). Some observations concerning bilingualism and second-language teaching in developing countries and in North America. In Hornby, P.A. (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social, and educational implications*. New York: Academic Press.

Tucker, G.R. & D'Anglejan, A. (1971). Some thoughts concerning bilingual education programs. *Modern Language Journal, 55*, 491-493.

United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) (1976). Child Center Project, Final Report. Milwaukee, Wis.: United Migrant Opportunity Services, Inc. (ED 128 071).

United States Commission on Civil Rights (1975). *A better chance to learn: Bilingual-bicultural education*. Clearinghouse Publication No. 51.

Wilson, R. (1970). *Curricular implications of the relationships between language and thought* (ED 038 639).

APPENDIX

1. Benjamin, R.C. (1969). A Bilingual Oral Language and Conceptual Development Program for Spanish-Speaking Pre-School Children (see Miranda et al., 1968 (ED 034 568) for a description of the actual lessons)

   The program consists of a detailed series of linguistically prepared oral language lessons to aid teachers who are not educated in ESL (English as a second language) methods. The lessons (59 in English and 61 in Spanish) each take approximately 15 minutes and are given 3 per day for a period of 8 weeks. The program also stresses the learning of basic intellectual skills, i.e., spatial relations, temporal relations, seriation, and classification. Conceptual content is first introduced in Spanish. English structures are introduced in situations calling for meaningful communication about relevant content; there is little direct manipulation of language patterns. There is also a recognition in the language lessons of structures which are problematic for Spanish speakers.

2. Adkins, D.C., Crowell, D.C. & Loveless, P.H. (1970). Iterative Research in Curriculum Development: A Preschool Language Model

   This is a preschool language curriculum incorporating the lexicon and phrases most frequently used by American 5-6-year-olds into a carefully sequenced program for Hawaiian Head Start children monolingual in pidgin English. It was hypothesized that a lack of familiarity with the language code of the school would adversely affect the children's future educational opportunities. The language program is the first activity of the day, divided into three 20-minute segments: 1) the language lesson; 2) informal language-strengthening activities; and 3) development of general school activities. Language patterns are divided into the following areas: conversations, labels, verbs, colors, opposite words, prepositions, and questions. Different stimuli are used to teach concepts, and language patterns are practiced in a variety of modes (e.g., singing, clapping, etc.).

3. Cornett, J.D. et al. (1974). Effect of an Intervention Program on "High Risk" Spanish American Children

   The program is an intervention program based on the Responsive Environment Concept (see Askins et al., 1974, below) for 3-, 4-, and

5-year-old Spanish American "high risk" children (defined on the basis of family income, educational level, language disability and low birth weight).

4. Johnston, B. (1968). Early Childhood Education in American Samoa

The aim of the program was to increase the power of language and thinking in 5-year-olds through the development of aural/oral language skills in Samoan and the enhancement of concept formation through culturally relevant activities and materials. The program is attended by children for five weeks before school entry. A pilot program with 15 children was first carried out to determine the appropriateness of the curriculum materials, observe the responses of children and parents, and begin training personnel who would later train teachers. Parents and children responded enthusiastically to the program and it was extended to 800 children.

5. Askins, B. et al. (1974). Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program

This program is an intervention program for 80 3-4-year-old Spanish-speaking children at two sites. The purpose of the project is to demonstrate that early childhood bilingual intervention will facilitate the learning of English and Spanish as well as enhance the child's cognitive, affective and psychomotor development. The program is based on the concept of "responsive environment," i.e., a setting or environment which facilitates the learning of complex symbolic skills (see Moore, 1964). Thus, the program can be described as falling within a cognitive developmentalist approach to early childhood education (Escobedo, 1978). The curriculum consists of group activities as well as 4 experimentally developed sets of materials for individuals or small groups of children designed to facilitate cognitive and language development (Piaget Early Childhood Curricular Materials, Project LIFE, Responsive Environment Typing Booth, and the Peabody Language Development Kit). Both languages are used equally in the program by bi ingual teachers. The program includes the instructional unit, community-parental involvement through a planned home visit program, and staff development.

6. Askins, B. et al. (1975). Responsive Environment Program for Spanish American Children (REPSAC)

The program is a half-day intervention program for "high risk" 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children, i.e., children of low birth weight who will also probably have other handicaps as they enter school. For the instructional component see Askins et al. (1974).

7. UMOS Child Center Project (1976)

The program is an intervention program designed to help prepare Latino preschool children (mainly the children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers) for their school start by supporting the children's language and cultural identity. The center served 50 3-5-year-old children in each year of its 3-year operation period. The educational program does not consist of a special curriculum but is based on guidelines for early childhood developmental programs (Head Start) which bilingual teachers adapt to the Latino culture and language. All activities are presented in both languages, although the main emphasis is on the dominant language (i.e., Spanish). The child is taught to appreciate both Anglo and Latino cultures. The program includes an active parental component and an emphasis on having male teachers present in the classroom.

8. Gunther, P.E. (1976). Basic Skills After School Pre-kindergarten Program

This program was an after school pre-kindergarten program for two hours each day which aimed to improve reading, math readiness, and English language skills in 45 pre-kindergarten children. The program also included a simultaneous auxiliary component for parents (sewing class) as well as workshops. The educational program emphasizes a cognitive/affective approach to learning through the manipulation of toys, self-expression through art and music, and concept learning through concrete experiences. English language learning occurs through the exposure to a free flow of language, listening, and games.

9. O'Farrell, B. (1970). A Study of Child Care

The program is an all-day Head Start Program for 2½ to 5-year-olds of both Spanish American and Dutch ancestry. Children are separated

into five classes according to age. Bilingual teachers are present in the classroom. The Michigan Oral Language Series is used for brief periods each day and once a week there is a Spanish lesson for all children in the program. The program is unstructured and children are free to try a variety of different activities, many of which emphasize the development of logical and conceptual skills. Parents are involved in many aspects of the program. A staff training component on child development is included.

10. Quintanilla, G. (1976). The "Little School of the 400"

Started in 1957 in Texas to meet the needs of Spanish dominant children, the purpose of the program is to teach five-year-olds 400 basic English words to help children cope with school instruction in the mainstream classroom. Both languages are used in teaching these words which are organized into units and taught through using objects relevant to the child's background. The program also attempts to reinforce the child's cultural heritage through, e.g., games and activities, the development of the child's self-concept, and the encouragement of parent participation. Many of the principles developed were subsequently used in Head Start.

11. Fishman (1975). Designing and Implementing an Early Childhood Italian Bilingual-Bicultural Education Program

This is a bilingual program for children at the pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and first-grade levels, i.e., 4-6-year-olds. Components of the program include inservice training, curriculum development, parent involvement, and community outreach. Children attend the bilingual program for half the day and the regular school program for the remainder of the day. All teachers are bilingual and, whenever possible, come from the community served by the school. Both languages are used in instruction although the program description does not specify in what way. The curriculum is written by teachers with the aid of a professional curriculum writer. The program is based on an open classroom model, emphasizing learning through doing in interaction with concrete objects. Learning is organized around curricular units: self-awareness, school, family, community, native heritage and larger world, which are explored through various modes such as role play, music and movement, social studies and math. Each unit

includes behavioral objectives, procedures and vocabulary in both languages. Parents are actively involved in the program including monthly meetings about the program (with translation services available), volunteer work in the classroom (including supervision workshops for this), and language classes in English. An important goal is that the bilingual classrooms not be isolated from the rest of the school (see, e.g., Fillmore, 1977), and regular information meetings were held with other staff members outside the program in order to increase integration. This generated much enthusiasm and resulted in language classes being started in Italian for all staff members which incorporated vocabulary which would be useful in communicating with parents and children

12. Tuscon Early Education Model (TEEM) (1972)

The purpose of the program is to enable disadvantaged children to achieve the necessary language competence, intellectual competence, motivation and societal arts and skills in order to function in the mainstream classroom. The program is not bilingual as such but emphasizes language development in English, although incorporating experiences from the child's cultural and familial background. The components of the program are instruction, psychological services and parental involvement. There is no set curriculum but teachers plan activities which fit in with the program's philosophy with an emphasis on the following principles: modelling, integration of the above mentioned skill areas in meaningful learning tasks, individual work with children, and reinforcement. Teachers ask questions to children in English which encourage them to develop functional language ability. In many settings Spanish-speaking and English-speaking children are mixed. There is an active psychological services component which helps teachers to evaluate children and develop activities which encourage the development of specific skills. The program is also actively coordinated with a university research institution. Parents, through various phases of the program, are helped to modify the home environment in order to reinforce the principles of classroom instruction in the home. Eventually parents may participate as paraprofessionals in the classroom.

13. Bilingual Early Childhood Program (1972)

This educational model was developed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) for children from three to five years of age. The program builds up the first language (Spanish) and then systematically introduces the same concepts in English. Initially, program presentation is 80 percent Spanish; by the end of the year it is mainly in English, however. The program recognizes that many disadvantaged children enter school without the experiences which will ensure that they succeed, as well as a deficit in perceptual ability (auditory, visual, and vocal). In order to correct for this, the child is given an intensive training in 9 areas organized around familiar themes, e.g., clothing, food, animals, and environment. These areas are: visual, auditory, motor, ideas and concepts, English syntax, building vocabulary, prewriting, thinking and reasoning, and exploring and discovering. There is a detailed curriculum guide for teachers including behavioral objectives and procedures. Periodic testing is also carried out in order to determine whether the child has achieved the stated objectives.

14. Oral Language Program (1972)

The Oral Language Program is a complete program for teaching English to 5-7-year olds. It consists of a detailed set of lesson guides produced by the Southwest Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL) based on ESL material developed at UCLA. The present material is the result of extensive research and field trials. The program consists of 147 lessons (covering a period of one year) emphasizing the oral/auditory aspects of English. The 25-minute long lessons sequence and control the language which is presented to the child. An informal version of the standard dialect is presented in which natural conversation forms are emphasized. Children are taught in small groups (a maximum of 10) which enables individualized instruction. The use of real objects and toys which are familiar to the child are used as it is felt easier for children to converse around such concrete objects. Teachers use principles of reinforcement, immediate feedback, and modeling. A detailed teacher guide describes the objectives, materials and presentation for each lesson. Culturally relevant material is presented in special daily lessons and children are taught that they can also talk about familiar experiences in a new language. The language package also contains a teacher training component.

15. North, R.D. et al. (1969). Pre-Kindergarten Program, 1968-69

The program, a pre-kindergarten intervention program for disadvantaged children in New York City, was designed to give children opportunities for intellectual growth, help develop a positive self-image and attitude toward learning, and increase parents' interest in their children's learning. The program was later extended to 9,240 children in 188 schools. The model does not employ a special curriculum but consists of a free classroom climate which encourages exploration. Community involvement is emphasized through involving paraprofessionals from the surrounding community and making maximal use of community resources. Although the program was highly successful in helping children to learn basic concepts and fundamental discriminations, it was questionable how effective it was for the 40 percent Spanish-speaking children who attended. These children performed relatively poorly in all areas except mathematics which no doubt reflected their limited ability to understand much of what was said. It was suggested that an ESL component be added to the program as well as bilingual aides.

16. Teachers College Bilingual/Multicultural Preschool Curriculum Model (1977)

This model is a mixed-class bilingual model for English and Spanish-speaking 3-4-year-olds. The child's first language is used as a base for second language learning which occurs both informally and in teacher-directed daily sessions. English-speaking children are expected to learn to understand Spanish even if they do not speak it, and both groups are taught to appreciate both cultures. The curriculum consists of a teacher's manual, activities file, sample materials, and resources list. Parents are actively involved in the program in monthly workshops and workshops are also held for staff development.

17. High/Scope Bilingual/Bicultural Preschool Curriculum Development Project (1977)

This is a program for 3-4-year-olds based on a cognitive-developmentalist theoretical perspective achieved through a curriculum which is drawn from the culture and environment of the child. The program builds on key experiences (50 in number) which form a background of concepts, skills and language competence. It is suggested that competence in any

language is a function of general thinking skills and that children must first learn about the world before they can talk about it. Children learn through actively interacting with the environment rather than through didactic teaching experiences. Thus, there are no formal language lessons but both languages are learned through naturally interacting with peers and adults in meaningful learning situations. Simultaneous translation and code switching are not seen as harmful to the child, but can impart the attitude that both languages are important and respected. To connect the program with the surrounding community, parents are actively involved. The role of parents and paraprofessionals in the classroom is considered as important as that of teachers.

18. University of California-Santa Cruz. Bilingual/Bicultural Preschool Curriculum Model (1977)

The model is a bilingual model for mixed groups containing both English and Spanish-speaking children. The main theoretical contribution of the model concerns the concept of cognitive learning styles (see Ramirez & Castañeda, 1974). Two contrastive cognitive learning styles, i.e., field sensitive and field independent are described. Children are reinforced in their preferred style but also given opportunities to function in the contrasting style so that they will become "bicognitive." An important component of the teacher training is thus child observation techniques and checklists are contained in the report for assessing children's preferred style. Priority is given to the child's first language, although the second language is also taught. The curriculum model consists of a teacher's manual, curriculum guide, resources manual and units (presented in Spanish and English on the same page). The units are thematically organized and contain general objectives, language objectives, procedures, and second language follow-up suggestions.

19. Amanecer (A Multicultural Action Network for Early Childhood Education Resources) (1977)

The model combines elements of the theories of Piaget, Montessori, and Maslow with information on children and their community obtained through teacher observations and interviews with parents. The curriculum plan gives the teacher a theoretical base for implementing a

program that is theoretically, linguistically and culturally appropriate. Teacher objectives are specified together with alternatives for action. Parents and paraprofessionals are actively involved in the program, and language learning occurs through an interaction with many adults.

20. Early Childhood Education Learning System (1969)

The program, developed by the Southwest Educational Developmental Laboratory, is a program for disadvantaged Mexican-American children in the 3-5-year-old age range. It focuses on visual, auditory, motor, English language and expanded language development by building on the child's native language and systematically introducing English by using concepts learned first in Spanish. Formal language lessons are given daily. Skill areas to be developed are built around units based on the child's experiences and culture and concepts are taught through a variety of modalities.

Tidigare utgivna rapporter i serien fr o m mars 1979

49. Werdelin, I. PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION. October 1979.

50. Ekholm, M. ETT FORSKNINGSPROJEKTS INFLYTANDE PÅ ETT UTBILDNINGSPROGRAM. En subjektiv betraktelse. INOVA-projektet. Delrapport nr 2. Oktober 1979.

51. Hultman, G. & Carlsson, G. UTBILDNING FÖR SKOLLEDARE FÖRE SKOLLEDAR-UTBILDNINGEN. USU-projektet nr 4. Januari 1980.

52. Eriksson, K.H. & Guttormsen, E. SKOLAN OCH SLÖJDEN. LÄRARE OM SLÖJDEN I GRUNDSKOLAN. Projektet Laborativ slöjd. Rapport nr 8. Januari 1980.

53. Eriksson, K.H., Guttormsen, E., Lundberg, T. & Malmberg, K. SKOLAN OCH SLÖJDEN. SLUTRAPPORT. Projektet Laborativ slöjd. Rapport nr 8. Januari 1980.

54. Hultman, G. KAN SKOLAN FÖRÄNDRAS? Skolan ur ett organisationsteoretiskt perspektiv och dess förutsättningar för förändring. Synpunkter inför en utvärdering av skolledarutbildningen och personallagsutbildningen. ESU-projektet: Effekter av Skolledarutbildningen. Delrapport nr 1. Januari 1980.

55. Dubell, F. MOBILIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT. The Portugal-project. Document No. VII. January 1980.

56. Borgbrant. J. LEDNINGSUTVECKLING - ÄR DEN MÖJLIG? Rapport från försöks-projekt vid två statliga myndigheter. UPP-projektet: Utvecklingsprogram för personalledningsfunktionen. Delrapport nr 3. Februari 1980.

57. Hultman, G. SKOLLEDARE OM SKOLLEDARUTBILDNINGEN. En enkätstudie. USU-projektet. Delrapport nr 5

58. Ellström, P-E. & Winter, H. SUCCESSIV ANTAGNING OCH LÄRARES VAL AV UNDER-VISNINGSFORMER INOM AMU. SINAMU-projektet: Successiv antagning vid AMU-center. Delrapport nr 2. Maj 1980.

59. Werdelin, I. THE CONCEPT OF VALIDITY. June 1980.

60. Werdelin, I. HÖGRE UTBILDNING OCH FORSKNING. Juni 1980.

61. Ekholm, M. EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS IN SWEDEN. Results and aspects of future evaluative activities. ESU-projektet: Effekter av skolledarutbildningen. Delrapport nr 2. September 1980.

62. Erasmie, T. ADULT EDUCATION I. An introduction to research and development work. October 1980.

63. Erasmie, T.(scientific editor) & Dubell, F. (editor). ADULT EDUCATION II. Research for the People, Research by the People. An introduction to Participatory Research. December 1980.

64. Bäckström, L. & Erlandsson, A. PRODUKTUTVECKLING GENOM UTBILDNING: Genom-förande och utvärdering av ett participations-inriktat arbetssätt för att öka kreativiteten inom ett industriföretag. Augusti 1980.

65. Norbeck, J. INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN ADULT EDUCATION AS REFLECTED IN CONCRETE PROGRAMMES. The Portugal Project. December 1980.

66. Erasmie, T. BASIC NEEDS AND EDUCATION IN PORTUGAL. Some indicators for allocating resources. March 1981.

67. Dahlén, A-B. & Erasmie, T. VUXENUTBILDNING I UTVECKLING. Problem - Trender. Rapport från symposiet "Språkfärdighet och språkkompetens hos kortutbildade vuxna.

68. Malmquist, E. DEVELOPING READING ABILITY - A WORLDWIDE CHALLENGE: THE PRESENT SITUATION AND AN OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE. March 1981.

69. Werdelin, I. & Arnberg, L. (editors). DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF LINKÖPING. Graduate Studies and Research. July 1981.

70. Erasmie, T., Dubell, F. (editor), de Vries, J. (scientific editor). RESEARCH FOR THE PEOPLE - RESEARCH BY THE PEOPLE. Selected papers from the international forum on participatory research in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, 1980. September 1981.

71. Persson, U-B. VUXNAS LÄS- OCH SKRIVFÖRMÅGA. En problemområdesöversikt. Januari 1982.

72. Riis, U. PEDAGOGISKT IDEPROJEKT FÖR ALLMÄNLÄKARE. April 1982.

73. Arnberg, L. BILINGUAL EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN IN ENGLAND AND WALES. Juni 1982.

74. Sani, N. HANDLEDARUTBILDNING FÖR ALLMÄNLÄKARE. En enkätstudie bland 66 kursledare. Juni 1982.

75. Sani, N. HANDLEDARUTBILDNING FÖR ALLMÄNLÄKARE. En enkät- och intervjuundersökning bland kursdeltagare. Juni 1982.

76. Riis, U. HANDLEDARUTBILDNING FÖR ALLMÄNLÄKARE. Sammanfattning och slutsatser. Juni 1982.

77. Blomberg, I. FORTBILDNINGENS ROLL I EN YRKESKÅRS UTVECKLING. Juni 1982.

78. Carlsson, Y., Hult, H., Karlsson, B., Kuyumcu, E., Larsson, G. & Lindgren, R. VUXNAS KOMMUNIKATIONSFÄRDIGHETER. En undersökning av hur väl vuxna förstår myndighets- och massmediaspråk samt vardagsmatematik. September 1982.

79. Ekholm, B., Ekholm, M. & Hedin, A. DAGHEMSKLIMAT. Bakgrund och mätinstrument. September 1982.

80. Johansson, B., ARBETARKVINNOR OCH BARNTILLSYN I NORRKÖPING. En studie av arbetarrörelsens inställning i barntillsynsfrågan speglad i Östergötlands Folkblad 1905-1912. April 1983.

81. Forslund, K. LOKALT UTVECKLINGSARBETE INOM SKOLAN. En försöksverksamhet med fortbildnings- och utvecklingsarbete baserad på lokala arbetslag. MOL-projektet. Modeller för lärarfortbildning. Maj 1983.

82. Ekholm, M., Eklund, H., Erasmie, T., Eriksson, K.H. & Werdelin, I. FEM UPPSATSER. OM HANDLEDNING OCH AVHANDLINGSARBETE. Juni 1983.

83. Ellström, E.; Ellström, P-E. SOCIAL INTERAKTION MELLAN HÖRSELSKADADE OCH HÖRANDE BARN I INTEGRERADE FÖRSKOLEGRUPPER. En forskningsöversikt rörande integration av döva och hörselskadade barn i vanlig förskola. Juni 1983.

ISBN 91-7372-715-6
ISSN 0348-4785

71

TRYCK-CENTER AB, Linköping 1983